COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XI. No. 12.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 21, 1807. [PRICE 10D.

"The bringing in of Strangers for aid, hath been pernicious to most States, where they have been admitted" "but to England fatal. We do bless God, that hath given your Majesty a wise understanding heart to dis-" "cern of those courses, and that such power produceth nothing but weakness and calamity. And we" "beseech your Majesty to pardon the vehemency of our expression, if, in the loyal and zealous affections" "we bear to your Majesty and your service, we are bold to declare to your Majesty and the whole world," "That we hold it far beneath the heart of any free Englishmen to think, that this victorious nation should" "now stand in need of German Soldiers to defend their own King and the Kingdom."——REMONSRTANCE OF THE COMMONS TO CHARLES I. in the year 1628.

TO THE

FREE AND INDEPENDENT ELECTORS

OF THE

CITY AND LIBERTIES OF WESTMINSTER.

LETTER IX.

GENTLEMEN,

In the last letter which I had the honour to address to you, I gave the reasons for my not entering, at that time, into any examination of the evidence and reported proceedings, in the case of Mr. Paull's last petition. The same reasons will prevent me from doing it now; because, though the proceedings will, probably, be closed before this sheet reaches the press, there will not be time sufficient for me to say what I could wish to say upon the subject; and, there are several topics, upon which, in the mean while, I think it may be useful to address you.

The first of these topics is, the case of the Honourable Cochrane Johnstone, whose petition to the House of Commons you will find in the preceding sheet, at page 403, and who was, as you will there have seen, Colonel of the Eighth West India Regiment and Governor of the Island of Dominica, until the year 1803. When you have read that petition, gentlemen, you will be in complete possession of the merits of the case; you will be able to form a correct judgment as to the treatment which Mr. Johnstone has received, and also as to the conduct of all the parties concerned. It will, therefore, only remain for me to state to you some facts, and to submit to you some observations, relating to the *redress* which he is likely to obtain.—The petition was presented to the House of Commons on the 10th instant, by Mr. Whitbread; but, gentlemen, it is right that you should be informed, that Mr. Johnstone had, previous to that day, asked upwards of *two hundred and fifty* of the members to present his petition, and that, of that number, he found not one who would do it!——Mr. Whitbread, in presenting the petition, observed, that he understood it to have been refused by several members; but, "for "himself, he thought it his bounden duty, "as a member of parliament, to present any "petition, complaining of grievances, and "couched in proper and respectful language; "but, that he did not hold himself respon-"sible for the accuracy of the allegations "contained in the petition, nor to make "any subsequent motion in consequence of "it." He, therefore, simply moved, that the petition should lie upon the table, which motion was seconded by Sir Edward Knatchbull, who held the same opinion with respect to the duty of presenting petitions. The only two persons that spoke on the other side were Mr. William Dundas and Mr. Plumer, member for Hertfordshire, who contended, that every member of parliament was at perfect liberty to do as he pleased as to the presenting of any petition whatever, be the matter and manner of it what they might. And, to say the truth, gentlemen, this is the doctrine, which has, for many years past, been acted upon.——I am particularly anxious that you should have your memories refreshed as to the "*invaluable right* of pe-"tition," as it is called; and, therefore, I shall inquire a little into the use of this right.——The use of it is, or rather was, to afford to *every* man the means of making his grievances known to the king, or to the parliament, or both; in order that he might be enabled to obtain redress, in cases where he could obtain redress by no other means. Mr. Blackstone, who was a judge, and who, of course, every where praises the *laws*, speaks in high strains of eulogium of this right, which he contrasts with the right of petition in Russia, as established by a law of the Czar Peter, and, according to which law, "every "subject might petition the throne after "having petitioned, without effect, two "ministers of state successively; but if, in "petitioning the throne, he was found to "be in the wrong, he was *to suffer death.*"

The consequence of which was, as Blackstone says, that no one dared to petition. The punishment of death, in case a petitioner was wrong, or was *made appear to be in the wrong*; in case he was confused and brow-beat out of his senses, or was outsworn by perjured witnesses; the punishment of death, in such a case, would, infallibly prevent every one from even thinking of petitioning. But, the Czar might have rendered the prevention nearly as complete in theory, and quite as complete as to all useful purposes, by only inflicting the punishment of jail and fine, and by providing some other little preliminary precautions, which it would be useless to point out to you very particularly.——Returning now to the right of petitioning in this happy country, and especially the right of petitioning the House of Commons, the *law* says, that no petition, touching important matters in Church or State, shall, unless it obtain the consent of three justices of the peace, or the majority of the grand jury of a county, or, in London, of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council, be signed by more than *twenty persons*, and that no petition shall be presented by more than *two persons* at one time. But, gentlemen, this being too much, it has been, by an order of the House of Commons I suppose, provided, that, to them, no petition shall be presented, *except by one of themselves*; so that, if the doctrine imputed, by the newspapers, to Messrs. Dundas and Plumer be sound, the right of petition is a right to petition one of the members of the House to permit us to petition the House itself; or, in other words, a right to pray to be permitted to pray! Nor, do I, indeed, see how the doctrine of Mr. Whitbread removes the difficulty; for, suppose none of the members will present your petition. What are you to do? Mr. Whitbread says, it is their "*bounden duty* to do it, provided the petition be couched in *proper* and *decent* language," of which, observe, they are to be the sole judges; but, he does not say, that, if they refuse to perform this "bounden duty," any consequences follow with respect to themselves. So that, after all, the "invaluable right of petition," is a right to pray to be permitted to pray.—— This right, so largely exercised by Mr. Johnstone, produced, what? Not redress; no, nor even any motion for redressing his grievance, but merely the laying of his petition upon the table of the House. It was, the newspapers tell us, contended, by Mr. William Dundas, that the complaint was upon a subject, with which the House had no right to meddle; whence we are, of course, to conclude, that, in the opinion of this gentleman, at least, the House of Commons have nothing at all to do or to say with the species of power that is exercised over the officers of the army, a service which swallows up almost one half of the taxes annually collected in this taxed country. I have before asked, and I now ask again: if this country be, as we are told, from high authority, it is and must be, a *military country*, and if every man, having any command in that military, be placed, both as to fortune and reputation, at *the sole and absolute will of the king*, what *sort of government* must this country be under?—— Leaving you, Gentlemen, to answer this question; leaving you well to consider of the matter; leaving you to make up your minds thereupon, I shall now proceed to notice a speech, given by the newspapers, as made upon this occasion by *General Fitzpatrick*, the present Secretary at War, first laying that speech before you, just as I find it in the newspapers: "The Secretary at "War, although the honourable gentleman "had declared that it was not his intention "to follow up the presentation of the petition with any motion, would trouble the "House with a few words on the subject, "because an opinion had gone forth that he "(the Secretary at War) had pledged himself to bring forward a motion, founded "on the case stated in this very petition, and "he was therefore glad to have an opportunity of publicly refuting that assertion. "The fact was (as those gentlemen who "were members of the last parliament must "recollect) that when he had given a notice on this subject, he observed that in "other cases as well as the present, great "abuses had arisen in the administration of "military justice, from the practice of confiding to the Judge Advocate General the "high and important trust of receiving his "Majesty's pleasure, with regard to the "sentences of Courts Martial, and that it "was very improper that matters of such "consequence should be decided upon without a reference to the Commander in "Chief. At that period, therefore, he had "given notice, that in the ensuing session "he would bring forward some motion on "the subject. In giving that notice, he "had stated that the petitioner's, as it was "one of the most recent, was also one of "the strongest cases in point. Subsequently the change in administration had taken "place; he had entered into office, and in "consequence of the representations which "he had thought it his duty to make on the "subject, he was happy to acquaint the "House, that the practice complained

" would in future be discontinued. The " Judge Advocate General would still com- " municate to his Majesty the sentences of " Courts Martial, but the decision of his " Majesty thereon would be received by the " Commander in Chief, and be by him " communicated to the army at large. Of " the present case the Commander in Chief " had no cognizance but that which he de- " rived from the Judge Advocate General. " One object of the petitioner, namely, to " recover his rank in the army, was by no " means a fit subject on which to institute a " discussion in parliament; and the other " object, to prevent the recurrence of such " a case, the statement which he had just " made shewed it had been already attain- " ed. He could not refrain from saying " thus much in refutation of the calumnies " that had been so liberally vented against " him."——As to the " calumnies" that may have been vented against this honour- able, nay right honourable, man, we will speak by-and-by. But, first let us see how his doctrine about the powers of parliament, squares with what is, upon other occasions, asserted with regard to those powers. Par- liament has, without any qualification, been called *omnipotent;* nor did I ever hear of any one who thought himself guilty of blas- phemy in so calling it. We know that, to *us* ward, it has great powers, witness the taxes, which its acts compel us to pay. It can do almost any thing; but, it cannot, it seems, even make an attempt to afford re- dress to an officer of the army. That little department, upon which eighteen millions a year of our taxes are expended, is, as to the treatment of its officers, quite out of its juris- diction. The parliament can, indeed, alter the laws for the raising and the dismissing and the trying and the punishing and the re- warding of the non-commissioned officers and soldiers; but, as to the management and treatment of the officers, it is, according to General Fitzpatrick, incompetent to meddle in the smallest degree; though, you will ob- serve, gentlemen, that this same honourable man, did, before he came into office, give notice of a motion, which he meant to make in the House of Commons, touching the treatment of officers of the army, and even touching the treatment of this very Mr. Johnstone; and why did he give that notice, if the restoring of that gentleman to his rank (the withholding of which from him was the alleged grievance) was " not a fit " subject whereon to institute a discussion " in parliament?" *What did he mean to do* by that motion? He must have had in view some parliamentary enactment, resolution, or address, which would have had for its ob- ject the redress of Mr. Johnstone's griev- ance, or, at the very least, the prevention of similar grievances in future. If his intended motion had not one, or both of these objects, the inevitable conclusion is, that it was a motion intended merely for party purposes; a motion to assist in harassing the then mi- nisters, and in driving them from their places. In the reported speech above- quoted, he would seem to affect to believe, that, from being in office, he has been able to effect, by his mere influence, that which he wished the parliament to effect. He says, " I am *happy* to inform the House, " that the practice complained of will, *in* " *future,* be discontinued. The Judge Ad- " vocate General will still make the report " of the proceedings of Courts Martial to the " king; but, the decision of his Majesty " thereon will, in future, *be received by the* " *Commander in Chief, and be, by him com-* " *municated to the army.*" Well, and what is this? What has this alteration done for the officers of the army? The decisions of the king used to be conveyed to the Duke of York by the Judge Advocate General, and now the Duke of York is to take them im- mediately from the king himself. A mighty change indeed! General Fitzpatrick told the House, *while he was out of place,* that he " could not conceive why the lives, for- " tunes, and characters of his Majesty's mi- " litary officers should not be entitled to as " solemn a consideration as those of every " other subject in the country." But, is this object now effected? Has the alteration, above-described by him, rendered the mode of deciding, in these cases, *more solemn* merely by causing the Judge Advocate Ge- neral to cease to convey to the Duke of York the decision of the king? Have the " lives, " fortunes, and characters," of the officers of the army derived any security from this alteration? This mere alteration in the mode, by which the king's decisions *are to be* conveyed from the king to the army?—— But, before we proceed any further, let us see the whole of this famous general's speech, as it stands reported, under the date of the 28th of June, 1805, which speech I have once before published, but which, per- haps, Gentlemen, some of you may never have read, and which every one of you should read, because this subject is, of all others, the most important.—" I rise, Sir, " to mention a subject, on which it is my " intention hereafter to submit a motion to " the House; and I wish to take the pre- " sent opportunity of doing so, because it " relates to that military administration

" which is to form part of the business of " this day's discussion. The present advanced state of the sessions will prevent " my being able to bring forward any motion, though I *wish it much*. It is, however, a subject of such *extreme importance*, " that it is necessary for me to take some " notice of it. The House may be assured " I shall state it in form on a future occasion and *as early as possible*. The " subject consists of a very *gross and alarming evil*;—one which, I apprehend, " has but lately crept into the administration of the Military Law of this country. " I trust, the practice to which I allude is " an innovation of not many years standing. " I am informed it is. It respects the execution of the duties of the office of Judge " Advocate General of the army. I find, " that under the present practice, there is " in the office of Judge Advocate, the assumption of a power, which I conceive " is not consistent with that office, and *not warranted by the laws and constitution of this country*.—Every gentleman who " hears me, knows how great the extent of " the Royal Prerogative is with respect to " the Military Government. Every one " knows the power of his Majesty to dismiss, without a Court Martial, any person " who bears a commission in the army.— " I should be the last man to call in question the Royal Prerogative; but I am " sure no man will contradict me when I " say, that a Prerogative of such extent " ought to be exercised *under the advice of responsible Ministers*. The law of this " country enables his Majesty to appoint " Courts Martial for military offences. The " law places in his Majesty the right of " confirming or remitting their sentences, " but I do not believe that the law or the " constitution of this country could ever intend that the officer of the Crown, in the " exercise of such a prerogative, should be " the Judge Advocate of the army. I believe he is at present the sole adviser of " the Crown. I believe that this practice " has prevailed only during a part of the " time the Right Hon. Baronet has been in " possession of it.—Formerly the transmission of sentences of Courts Martial was " through the office of the Secretary at " War. The Secretary at War of course " became responsible for the advice he gave. " With respect to his decision, I am not " sure that I think that was sufficiently solemn for a decision of so important a " point. *I cannot conceive why the lives, fortunes, and characters of his Majesty's military officers, should not be entitled to as solemn a consideration as those of every other subject in the country*.—Every one " knows that those important concerns, as " they affect other classes of his Majesty's " subjects, are decided by his Majesty in " Council. I think the same solemnity " ought to be observed with regard to the " Sentences of Courts Martial; but that " will be a question for future consideration. " That this practice does prevail, and has " been attended with great hardship to individuals, I shall be enabled to shew in a " case that has lately occurred, *and has spread the greatest alarm throughout the whole army*. I allude to the case of " COLONEL COCHRANE JOHNSTONE, a gentleman, who, *after a Trial by a Court Martial, and an honourable acquittal, has, at the instance of the Judge Advocate, been exposed to the penalties and punishment attendant upon guilt*.—— " This is what I shall submit to Parliament. " I am aware that an appeal from the Sentence of any Court Martial to this House " is a delicate question; but in the present " case the appeal is in favour of the Court " Martial, and seeks redress against the " effects of *undue influence*. I beg pardon " for dwelling so long on the subject. I " have risen to give this notice, and *I shall bring forward the motion early next Sessions*. It will consist of two branches; " one will be a complaint against the " exercise of the office; the other will " refer to the means of defining the " power of the officer, and will suggest " some provisions as to the manner of " his conducting himself in future."—— Now, gentlemen, what was it that this honourable patriot out of place " *wished much*" to bring forward to the House of Commons? What was it that was of " *extreme importance*?" What was it that was " *a gross and alarming evil?*" What was it that was " *not warranted by the laws and constitution of this country?*" What was it that had " *spread the greatest alarm throughout the whole army?*" Why, forsooth, as the gallant and right honourable general *now* tells the House, it was the practice of the Judge Advocate General *being employed to convey the decisions of the King to the Duke of York!* Merely this! It was to do away this practice, that the honourable man now tells the House, he was going to bring forward a motion consisting of " *two branches*." But, the honourable man, when he was out of office, told the House, that the concerns touching the lives, fortunes, and characters of other classes of his Majesty's subjects, " were decided upon by the King in Coun-

" cil; and, that he thought, *the same so-* " *lemnity* ought to be observed, with regard " to the sentences of Courts Martial." But, now, behold, he had nothing more in contemplation than merely an alteration in the mode of *conveying* the decisions of the King to the Duke of York; which alteration, he is " happy" to inform the House, will, *in future*, take place!——Now, gentlemen, as to the " *calumnies*," which have been vented against this honourable personage, though I have never seen, or heard of, any such, I admit the possibility of attributing to him acts of wickedness and of baseness of which he has not been guilty, and, of course, I am ready to acknowledge, that calumnies may have been vented against him; but, while, I unequivocally make this acknowledgment, I positively deny, that I ever took part in such calumnies, having never done any thing more, with respect to him, than state a few plain and undeniable facts, namely; that, when he made the speech, giving notice of his motion for the next session, he was out of place; that, soon after Parliament met again, he was in place; that, soon after he was in place, he gave notice, from the Treasury bench, that he should not bring forward the motion, of which he had given notice from the opposition bench; that soon after that he, who had sold his commission as captain in the guards twenty years before, and who had never served a single day since, had a regiment given to him, worth about fifteen hundred pounds a year; and, finally, that, as Secretary at War, it was with himself to sign and pass his accounts and vouchers as colonel of a regiment. These are plain, undeniable, historical truths; and, until such truths are styled calumny, it will not, I am persuaded, be believed that I, at any rate, have participated in venting the calumnies, of which this right honourable person is reported to have complained.——Here, gentlemen, I should take my leave of this subject; but, I cannot refrain from saying a word or two upon the conduct of the news-papers respecting it. They have *not published the petition* of Mr. Johnstone, and their excuse is, that " the case is *already* " *before the public*." Yes, it was already before the public, though not in the same authentic and solemn form; but, what had they to do with placing it before the public? Not one of them ever made any publication of it; not a line did they ever insert upon the subject; and, had not this work of mine been in existence, not a word of it would the nation have known unto this day; though, during the time, that this most important case has been crying aloud for publicity, the columns of these most corrupt prints have been daily filled with quack-advertisements, with accounts of ministerial dinners, royal airings, and paid-for paragraphs in praise of Madam Catalani. Yes, Gentlemen, as I had occasion to declare to you during the late election, I am convinced, that the proprietors and editors of these prints are the basest, the very basest of all mankind, their hirers only excepted.

The next subject, Gentlemen, to which I am desirous of turning your attention, your *constant* attention, is one which was frequently touched upon during the election; I mean, the *foreign troops* now supported by us, and kept up and quartered in the heart of our country. What sentiments our forefathers entertained upon this subject, and in what language they thereon remonstrated with their sovereign, you will have seen from the passage which I have taken for my motto. Those sentiments I entertain; I am confident you entertain them; and, I, for my part, live in hopes of seeing a House of Commons, by whom such sentiments will again, in such language, be expressed.——In order that we may have a clear view of the matter in question, let us first hear what the constitution says with respect to the keeping up of foreign troops in this country. Mr. Blackstone, who, as I before observed, was looking out for a judgeship when he wrote his book, has the following passage upon the nature of our constitution as relating to the military. " To " prevent the executive power from being " able to oppress, says Baron Montesquieu, " it is requisite that the armies with which " it is entrusted, should consist of the *people*, and have the same spirit with the " people; as was the case at Rome 'till " Marius new-modelled the legions, by enlisting the rabble of Italy, and laid the " foundation of all the military tyranny that " ensued. Nothing, then, according to " these principles, ought to be more guarded against in a free state, than making " the military power, when such an one is " necessary to be kept on foot, a body too " distinct from the people. *Like ours*, " therefore" (I beg you to mark this), " it " should wholly be composed of *natural* " *subjects*; it ought only to be enlisted for " a short and *limited time*; the soldiers " should live intermixed with the people; " *no separate camp*; *no barracks*; no inland fortresses should be allowed." This Mr. Blackstone died some years, I believe, before the days of Pitt's power; an event very much to be regretted, because it would have been so delightful to hear him justify

(as he certainly would have done) all the introducing of foreign troops and all the camps and barracks of Pitt and Delancey. But, here we have his description of what the constitution was, in this respect, at the time when he wrote, which was just about the time that the present king came to the throne.——Not, however, to the opinions of any one are we to confine ourselves; for, besides the evident danger and disgrace of having foreign troops stationed amongst us; besides the absurdity of talking about popular freedom in a country where the king should have the power of introducing foreign troops at his pleasure,; the act of settlement, that act which contains the conditions, upon which the crown was settled upon the present family, expressly provides that "no "office of trust, civil or military, shall ever "be held by any one, who is not a native of "this kingdom, or who is not born of parents "natives of this kingdom." So that, if there were any doubt, if there could be any doubt, as to the introducing of foreign *soldiers*, it is impossible there can be any with respect to the introducing and keeping up of foreign *officers*. Yet, have we now several battalions of foreign soldiers in this kingdom, and these soldiers are under the command of foreign officers too, which foreign officers do, as a matter of course, occasionally take the command in the towns, barracks, and camps where they are stationed, and must necessarily, at times, command not only our native soldiers but our native officers also; and, it must be evident to you, that our fortresses, our dock-yards, and our arsenals, may be committed to their guardianship.——Gentlemen, in the year 1794, some Hessians were landed in the Isle of Wight, upon the ground of its being dangerous to their health to keep them on board of ship, until the time when the vessels would sail, they being destined for *foreign* service. In consequence of that landing, without the previous consent of Parliament, Mr. Grey (now Lord Howick) made a motion, declaring it to be unconstitutional and illegal for the King to introduce foreign troops without the consent of Parliament previously obtained, which motion was supported by Mr. Whitbread, Lord George Cavendish, Mr. Francis, Mr. Serjeant Adair, Mr. Yorke, Mr. William Smith, and Mr. Fox. The motion was opposed by Pitt, whose majority, of course, voted against it. Upon this occasion Mr. Francis said: "Not a word, indeed, does the *bill of rights* "contain about introducing a *foreign army*. "The men who framed it did not suppose "it possible, that it could ever enter into "an English heart to maintain, that the "King, by his prerogative, could, in any "circumstance, bring a foreign force into "Great Britain, without the consent of "Parliament. But, a distinction is taken, "which is supposed to be prodigiously ma-"terial. The ministers cannot introduce "foreign troops *in time of peace*. What "does this signify? They assert, that the "King can make war *when he pleases*, and "in time of war he can introduce foreign "troops; so that, if this doctrine be sound, "he can introduce foreign troops when he "pleases. If it be lawful, on that ground, "to bring in four thousand Hessians to-day, "why not ten thousand Austrians to-mor-"row, and twenty thousand Russians the "day following? A base, corrupt, and "abject people, when once they are pro-"perly frightened, will submit to any "thing for the sake of being defended. "The English nation will be threatened "with a French invasion, and, instead of "being called upon to defend themselves, "will be told, that they may be per-"fectly quiet, for that the King has subsi-"dized an army of Germans, and will take "care to protect them, without giving them "any further trouble. I trust that English-"men will look a little to the conclusion of "this doctrine, before it be too late."—— These were the sentiments of Mr. Francis, now, alas! *Sir Philip!* But, he ought to be spared for the sake of what he has done in times past. He has left us (for I regard him as defunct) many, very many excellent maxims and arguments; and to him we owe those statements, without which we were unable profitably to think upon subjects connected with that grand scheme of plunder and cruelty, the East-Indies.——In returning to the subject of the Hanoverian troops, you will perceive, gentlemen, that the consent of Parliament *has been obtained* in this case, or, at least, Acts of Parliament have been passed authorizing the raising and the keeping up of these troops. But, this does not do away my objection to it; for, gentlemen, to what measure did Pitt or any other minister, of late days, ever fail in obtaining the *consent of Parliament?* The Act of Settlement provides, that no foreigner shall hold, in this kingdom, any place of *trust*, civil or military; and, to suppose that this meant to exclude foreign officers from our army, while it left room for the introducing of both foreign officers and foreign troops into the nation, there to remain established, is an absurdity not, for one moment, to be tolerated.——The *expense* of these Hanoverians is enormous, in propor-

tion to their numbers. By an Act past in the year 1804, the King was authorized to raise foreign troops, not exceeding in number 10 thousand men, and also to grant *commissions* to foreigners to serve as *officers* or as *engineers*. And, here we will stop, for a moment, gentlemen, just to observe, that, by this act, that part of the Act of Settlement, above spoken of, was, in effect, repealed. That the Parliament had power to repeal it, I do not deny; but, then, we ought never to be told of their *want of power to do any thing*, in the way of making laws. If they could repeal this, *to us*, the most important part of an act, which contained the conditions upon which the crown was settled on the present family, they surely had the power to afford Mr. Johnstone redress, and, by law, effectually to provide against similar grievances in future? This must be allowed us, unless it be contended, that the Parliament can do away no ancient provision, excepting only such provisions as were made for the protection of our liberties and lives. That there may be no hired anti-jacobin, no scribbling slave, to maintain this last-mentioned proposition, I shall not assert; but, I am very certain, that you, at least, would reject it with indignation.—The 10 thousand Hanoverians, which were authorized to be raised by the Act of 1804, received an addition to their numbers last year, when, on the 22d of March, another act was passed, authorizing the King to augment the number to 16 thousand. This is a prettylittle army of foreigners for us to have in the heart of our country; for the act expressly authorises the king to keep up 16 thousand of them *within this kingdom!*——In the accounts, laid before the House of Commons, of the disposing of the public money for the year 1805 (which is the last account of that sort that has yet been laid before the House), the sum expended upon the Foreign Troops *in that year*, is stated at £851,350. which, supposing the whole of the ten thousand men to have been enlisted before the commencement of that year, and supposing them to have been effective for every day in the year, makes rather more than 85 pounds, 2 shillings, and sixpence for one year for each man! Now, mark the contrast: it is stated, in the same account, that, the sum for defraying the charge, for the same year, of 135 thousand *effective* British troops including officer's pay and all allowances whatever, amounted to £4,635,188. So that, you see, supposing there to have been 10 thousand effective Hanoverians during the whole of the year, this 10 thousand men cost us nearly one *fifth* part as much as 135 thousand of our own countrymen cost us; though the number of the former is not a *thirteenth* part of that of the latter. I am not supposing, that the Hanoverians actually receive *higher pay* than our own soldiers; but, the various extra expenses attending them have been so great; and, indeed, so that we are compelled to pay the money, it is of little consequence who pockets or devours it. Yet, gentlemen, not one single member of parliament, not one single man amongst those, whom the king called "his faithful Commons," said a word against this charge; no, nor did any one, that I have ever heard of, ask a question about the matter!——What do we want with these foreigners? What necessity is there for their being kept up here? Are you; are any of us; is there a man amongst us so intolerably base as to allow, that the people of this kingdom are such wretched cowards as for it to be unsafe to entrust the defence of their country to themselves? If these Hanoverians were, indeed, hired by us to be sent to the *West* or the *East Indies*, or to *Gibraltar*, in order to spare the lives of our native troops, I should have much less objection to their being raised and kept up; but, not a man of them, that I have heard of, has been sent upon any such service. Their own country has been over-run, and is, at this moment, actually in the possession of the French. Where were *they* when the French took possession of their country? That they did not not sacrifice their *lives* in defence of it, we know; and I, for my part, have never heard of any battles that they fought in its defence. The newspapers did, indeed, inform us, that the Duke of Cambridge, "with no less fore-"sight than bravery, brought off the *plate* "from Hanover," and lodged it safely in England, to the great disappointment and mortification, no doubt, of those merciless plunderers, the French; but, even these vehicles, so fruitful in accounts of battles, never told us of any battles that were fought in Hanover, which seems to have passed as quietly under the yoke of France, as if there had not been a single soldier in it.——In taking another view of this introduction of foreign troops, I beg leave, by way of preliminary to observe to you, that there has lately sprung up amongst us, a philosopher of the name of Malthus, who, from his sentiments, one would suppose to be a German too, and who contends, that the great cause of pauperism and of misery in this country, is, the *superabundance of its population*; wherefore he recommends, as the sole effectual remedy, the *preventing*, by one means or another, the labouring people *from having*

so many children. Now, gentlemen, instead of this, I should recommend the sending of all the Jews and Italians and Negroes and Germans and other foreigners out of the country; and, of course, I should, were it only upon this ground, taking its solidity for granted, strenuously object to the bringing of 16 thousand Hanoverians, with all their wives and children, into it; especially when I reflect, that every article, which goes to the clothing and the feeding and the lodging and the warming of them, must be produced by our labour, they having been brought amongst us for purposes far different from that of partaking in our toil. Widely different, however, appear to be the sentiments of many other persons in this country, some of whom scruple not to justify the introduction of the Hanoverian troops; the placemen and taxgatherers applaud it in unqualified terms; and, even amongst the officers of the army (to such a degree does sycophancy prevail) we find some, who, like *Captain Mellish*, of Covent-Garden notoriety, stick enormous whiskers upon their faces, with no other rational view than that of being taken for Hanoverians.

The third subject, and the last, upon which I propose to address you, at present, is, *the toasts at the last dinner given to Sir Francis Burdett*, relating to which toasts, I have received two letters, the substance of the former and the whole of the latter I will lay before you. A gentleman, who, with that degree of self-complacency, which, in such cases, is very common, if not very allowable, calls himself "A TRUE ENGLISHMAN," tells me, that, for many years, he has, with pleasure and attention read my Register, and has, with few exceptions, admired it, and especially those parts thereof, wherein I have detected and exposed error, peculation, and corruption, in every department of the government; that, the unshaken loyalty which I so strongly expressed during the years 1803-4, and 5, did me great credit, and that he trusts, that my sentiments, in this respect, are unaltered; that he has, however, with some concern, remarked, that, since I have so warmly espoused the cause of Sir Francis Burdett, these effusions of loyalty have not been so frequent; that, Sir Francis Burdett may mean well, but, that his patriotism is too strongly marked with party madness; that he is convinced, that I retain the most ardent affection for our beloved king, in whose defence every true Englishman would shed the last drop of his blood, and that, therefore, he is surprised, that I have not expressed my abhorrence of the diabolical and "blasphemous" sentiment contained in the toast, "*our sovereign, the "Majesty of the people*," which sentiment none but a *traitor* would utter in this country; that, as I animadvert so freely upon the conduct of the greatest man this country ever produced (the late Mr. Pitt), "to whose administration we owe our existence as a "nation and all that we have enjoyed, do "enjoy, or expect to enjoy," he trusts that I will not be silent upon the subject of the toast.——Such is the first letter; and, to be sure, if one can, with perfect propriety, apply the epithet blasphemous to a political sentiment, it is that very sentiment, with which this letter concludes; for, gentlemen, what, upon matters of politics, can be uttered, more offensive and more insulting to the God of *truth*, than to ascribe our existence as a nation, together with all our enjoyments, past, present, and to come, to the administration of that man, who found the nation secure against all the world and conspicuously powerful when compared with her natural enemy, and who left her in jeopardy every hour, while that enemy, having conquered two-thirds of Europe, having got possession of all her coasts, from the Baltic to the Adriatic, was, at the moment when his administration ceased with his breath, actually in possession of the capital of Austria, the unfortunate sovereign of which had been urged to war by that very man; that man who found the annual charge upon us for the national debt 9 millions, and who left that charge increased to 29 millions; that man who found the annual poor-rates at 2 millions, and who left them at 6 millions; that man who lent £40,000. of the public money, secretly to two members of his majority in parliament, who lent it thus without interest, and without making the transaction known to his colleagues, or making any record or minute thereof; that man, who, in the very last year of his life, added nearly a million to the national debt in grants of new pensions and largesses to his adherents; and, not to weary you with the enumeration, who kept the Habeas Corpus Act, the act which was framed for the security of the persons of Englishmen, suspended for seven years at a time, and who caused to be prosecuted, as traitors, men whom the juries acquitted, and who were, from the Bench, declared to have sought nothing but that very reform, which this man himself had insisted upon as being absolutely necessary to the existence of the nation. If, Gentlemen, there be any thing, upon a political subject, which can properly be called blasphemous, it assuredly is, the ascribing to such a man our existence as a nation, together with all

our enjoyments, past, present, and to come. But, Gentlemen, of recrimination we stand not in need; nor will I ask this gentleman, who so much admired the ardour of my loyalty in 1803-4, and 5, whether he did not, during the whole of those years, with very little intermission, find a considerable part of every week's Register taken up in the *detecting and exposing of this very Mr. Pitt*; and, during the same years, the very same years, in *defending the conduct of Sir Francis Burdett*. I will waive these questions, and come at once to *the toast*, which is no other than the very toast, which was formerly given by the Duke of Norfolk, who is now a Lord Lieutenant and a Privy Councillor, which was drunk the other day at the rump of the Whig-Club by one of the king's "confidential servants," and to which I have, at a time like this, no other objection, than that it is not of plain and unequivocal meaning, which every thing ought to be that comes from the lips of honest politicians.——Of the only two remaining points that I have to take notice in this letter the first is, that it is, of all things in the world, the most unjust to accuse Sir Francis Burdett of "*party* rage." Enraged he may well be at seeing what is daily passing under his eyes; but, as to *parties*, though we have seen many, we have never yet seen one, that was not, at the bottom, hostile to him; and, for the best of all possible reasons, gentlemen, they being all bent upon fattening out of the public money, and he, in the opinions of all men of all classes, being known to be opposed to such fattening. The other point relates to the shedding of the last drop of every true Englishman's blood in support of the King; and first I would ask, this true Englishman, whether he has perceived, that there is any want, at present, of such support? The King has about two hundred thousand gentlemen in red and blue coats, or rather, jackets, to support him; and, of these, sixteen thousand are Hanoverians. These gentlemen have nothing else to do but to support him and his officers and his kingdom; and, under such circumstances, it does really seem quite uncalled for, if not impertinent, in a grey-coated individual to thrust himself forward with vows of devotion and sacrifice. When this true Englishman perceives any falling off in the power and influence of the crown; when he sees a Parliament so sturdy as to compel the King to give his sanction to acts of which he disapproves; nay, when he sees him giving up any point however loudly and whencesoever called for, then, indeed, his vows of devotion may possibly be reasonable and manly; but, as things now stand, the King is, happily, able to take care of himself; he has a numerous and well appointed army; his children are all amply pensioned; one of his sons is the Commander in Chief; his other sons have great commands; and he has the absolute power of cashiering, at pleasure, any one, or all, of the officers who are the cement of a force which costs the nation eighteen millions a year. These are not the marks of impotence, I take it; and, therefore, I once more beg my friend the true Englishman to keep his vows of devotion to himself, lest he expose himself to ridicule and contempt, as being, not the supporter of the weak, but one who shouts "*huzza for the strongest.*"——The other letter complains of a sin of *commission*, on my part, and is, as you will perceive, written in the true spirit of an inquisitor, or rather, of one of those despicable wretches, upon whom we may naturally suppose the *secret-service money* to be expended.—— "In your Register," says he, "Vol. XI. "page 236, you say: *the omission to drink* "*the King's health was a mere matter of* "*taste. The company* [at Sir Francis Bur- "dett's dinner] *did not choose to do it, and* "*they scorned to be guilty of hypocrisy.* It "appears to me, that you mean, by these "two sentences, taken with the context, "to say, that, as the company did not *feel a* "*wish for the continuance of the King's* "*health*, they scorned to be such hypocrites "as to express a wish they did not feel. If "you are the *fair, impartial* man you "profess to be, you will *insert this letter*, "and give me an unequivocal answer to "the two following questions: 1st, is my "construction of your meaning a just one? "2d, Were you one of the 1,500 persons, "present at Sir Francis Burdett's dinner, "who scorned the hypocrisy of expressing "a wish for the continuance of the King's "health?—I have paid the postage of this "letter, in order that you may have no "just *excuse* for refusing the insertion of it. "—I am, Sir, your's, &c. D. R. A. Clif- "ton, 23d Feb. 1807."——First, gentlemen, let me hope, that you will join me in admiration of the reasonableness of this man, who insinuates that I shall have no just pretensions to fairness and impartiality, unless I publish a charge, against you and myself, of being almost, if not quite *traitors in our hearts*; and this charge preferred, too, by one, who dares not put his name at the bottom of it. So far am I from thinking, that fairness and impartiality demand an insertion, in such a case, I am fully persuaded, that I should be justified in causing the letter

to be posted up at Cliftyn, and advertising to find out the black-hearted spy, who is the author of it, and to whose pocket I dare venture to say, I should be able to trace some part of the taxes raised upon us. But, gentlemen, there is nothing that we do, or that we wish, that need be disguised; and, therefore, though I protest against the right of any man to question me as to my *thoughts*; though that is a species of inquiry which even the infamous twelve tables of Rome would not have warranted, I will answer the two questions of this spy with perfect undisguise. You will, however, perceive, that he assumes, as admitted, in the latter part of the first question, that which the first question is intended to ascertain the truth of. The questions, stripped of this assumption, are: 1st, whether his be a right construction of my meaning; that is to say, whether I regard you as having tacitly declared, *that you did not feel a wish for the continuance of the King's health:* and, 2d, whether, I myself was at the dinner.——To both these questions I might give an answer in the single syllable, NO; but, that does not satisfy me. Not only did I not regard you as having tacitly declared, that you did not feel a wish for the continuance of the King's health; but, I declared, that your omiting to drink the health was a mere matter of *taste*; and, I added, that, to make it a rule to drink this health, upon all occasions, was the sure way to bring the thing into contempt, putting it upon a level with the "*God-save-the-king*" of a market-town bell-man, who, with that loyal and pious invocation concludes his notices relative to a dog's being lost, or the unexpected arrival of fresh herrings. But, gentlemen, I will evade nothing; I will suppose the giving of this toast to be a matter of sentiment; I will suppose, that the hired anti-jacobins, the placemen, and the tax-gatherers, when they give it, do really feel something more than the bell-man aforesaid; and, proceeding upon this supposition, let me ask, whether the toast implies any wish at all about the *health* of the King? I have sometimes thought, indeed, that, amongst those, who are quite as well off under the present king, as they possibly can be, I have observed the toast to be understood literally; nay, I have thought, that, now-and-then, there was not a little malice, towards another person, mixed with this wish for the continuance of the King's health. But, gentlemen, you and I, who know nothing of the King but what all the world knows; who cannot possibly entertain towards him any feeling of a mere personal nature; who know that he, as well as ourselves, is born to die; who, having no particular interests at stake upon his life, cannot possibly feel any anxiety about his health, other than that which public considerations may create: we, gentlemen, when we give the King's *health*, as it is called, give it, not as a sign of our wishes about that health; much less as a mark of *loyalty*, that is, of our fidelity to the King; for, to employ the toast in this latter sense would be to admit the necessity of giving some proof, or sign, of our not being traitors. No, gentlemen, when we give this toast, we give it as a *voluntary* expression of our admiration of the conduct of the king; and, gentlemen, I will declare, in spite of the insinuations of this spy, that, though my loyalty to the king is unshaken, though I would go as far as any man in the kingdom in the defence of all his just rights and prerogatives, and of course, in defence of his person if necessary, and for which rights and person I hope he will, in the day of need, have better defenders than spies, hired anti-jacobins, place-men, and tax-gatherers; though I always have been, and always am, truly loyal, I will declare, that, since the affair of Mr. Cochrane Johnstone, since the introduction of so many Hanoverian soldiers, and since an act was passed exempting the king's funded property from the income tax, while a tax of ten pounds in the hundred is laid upon the income of every one of his subjects, down to fifty pounds a year, not excepting the incomes of those who derive them from labour, study, or from venturing their lives in the army or the navy; since I have seen these things, gentlemen, and some others that I could mention, I will declare, that I have not felt quite so much of that admiration. But, because this is the state of my mind; because I do not choose voluntarily to come forward with expressions of my admiration of the king's conduct, am I to be suspected of *disloyalty?* Am I to be represented as a person who wishes to destroy the kingly government? Am I to be loaded with the reproach of endeavouring to throw my country into confusion? Verily, gentlemen, reproach so uncandid and unjust is not the means by which loyalty is likely to be cherished and preserved.—— Now, as to the 2nd question, *whether I was at the dinner*, I was not at it; but, though I was not there in person, my heart was with you; and, I am not sorry that an opportunity has been afforded me of thus publicly informing you, that, though at so great a distance, and though I could not have left home without great inconvenience for above two or three days, I should have gone to

London for the express purpose, had not your dinner been given upon the anniversary of a day which I had theretofore kept as a sort of festival, and which I could not have left unkept upon the occasion and for the reason referred to, without assuming to myself a degree of political importance far greater than that to which I could think myself entitled.——My inquisitorial correspondent is now, I hope, answered. Any remarks that he may choose to make under his *real name*, certified to be his real name by some reputable person known to me, I will insert in my Register; but, any repetition of his anonymous charges or insinuations I shall treat with silent contempt.

In my next letter, I intend doing myself the honour of addressing you upon the subject of the proceedings, in the House of Commons, relative to the last petition of Mr. Paull; and, in the meanwhile, I trust you will believe me to be

Your sincere friend
And obedient Servant,

Botley, March 19, 1807. WM. COBBETT.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

CONTINENTAL WAR.——After another three weeks of various rumours and of falsehoods, relative to victories of the Russians and Prussians, it appears, from an impartial perusal of all that has been published on both sides, that the victories, though pretty dearly bought, have been on the side of the French, who not only had kept the field of battle, but had, when the last intelligence came away, made considerable advances.—— We see, too, that the British merchants, residing in Russia, have been making a voluntary contribution for the defence of that empire. When steps like this are taken, it is pretty certain, that the parties taking them see some cause for alarm. These contributions will, I fear, prove not more efficacious than the proclamations of the Russian General to the Germans, the Polanders, and the French army; nor am I one of those who would seem to believe, that the Emperor of Russia's calling upon his people to rise in mass against the French will tend very much to his final success in the war. There is a *moral* cause constantly working for Napoleon. Every where he has found more friends than enemies; and, I am afraid, that the farther he goes, the greater will he find the proportion of the former. An officer of great merit and experience in our own army, in conversing with me, at the breaking out of the war between France and Prussia, seemed very confident of the success of the latter, observing that the French would find a great difference between Prussian and Austrian *discipline*. "Yes," said I, "were the war to be carried on upon the plains of Egypt, this "might be of some consequence as to its "event; but, unhappily for Prussia, the "war is to be carried on in the Prussian "states, and *the people* of those states are "to be umpires." By this time, he has been enabled to receive ocular demonstration upon the subject; and, I am persuaded that events will make him a convert to my opinion.——In the meanwhile, however, *we* have *made peace* with Prussia; and our ambassador has advanced 80,000l. for the purpose of defending the fortresses in Silesia, which fortresses were, it seems, surrendered to the French before the House of Commons had ratified the advance. This circumstance alone, however, is no proof of the impolicy of the advance; but, it appears to me, that, in the present state of things, to send the produce of our taxes to Prussia, or Russia is, in fact, sending them to increase the amount of the plunder of the French.——What may be the result of the ensuing campaign, upon the Continent, it would be presumptuous to predict; and it would be equally presumptuous to pretend to foresee in what particular way the general event will be brought about; but, for my part, when I look at what has passed within these seventeen years, taking the causes into view, it appears to me, that the whole of the continent will undergo a revolution, which might be a little retarded, but which would not be prevented, even by the death of Napoleon. Mr. Burke saw, and I see, no government to learn wisdom from experience; no, nor even from that severe teacher, adversity.

CATHOLIC BILL.——This bill, the introduction of which into the House of Commons was noticed some little time back, and which introduction, was, in that House, received with such general applause, has, it evidently appears, placed "his Majesty's "confidential servants" in an "unsatisfactory state;" and, as I hear to-day (having, of course, no intelligence later than that of *Wednesday*), it is probable they will have resigned their offices, before this sheet can have reached the public eye. The proceedings upon the bill were postponed, on Wednesday evening, by Lord Howick, without any time named for the resumption of them; and, unless they be resumed, there can be, of course, no alternative for the ministers, but that of resignation or indefeasible shame and disgrace. This will be perceived by all of them, and some of them,

at least, will not submit to everlasting disgrace. Lords Grenville and Spencer and Mr. Windham resigned in 1801, along with Pitt and Lord Melville, because they could not carry a measure of the same sort of much larger extent! and all the other conspicuous members of the present cabinet have both since and before, urged the adoption of that measure. Shame, therefore, eternal shame, must be imprinted upon the brow of each of them, if they now retain their places, without the carrying of this bill.——But, what do I see, in the daily newspapers, about the *cause* of stopping the progress of this bill? Why, the writers in those prints assert, in the most unqualified manner, that the cause is no other than *the king's disapprobation of it.* Well, the king may disapprove of the bill; but, is that any reason why it should not pass the two Houses of Parliament? What has the king to do with a bill, until the moment when it is presented to him for his approbation, or rejection? All laws, we are told, are to *originate* in one or the other of the Houses of Parliament, and when a law has passed the two Houses, and not a moment before, the king has to take cognizance of it. This is the language of the constitution of England; yet do the writers above-mentioned boldly assert, that the bill has been stopped in its progress by the will of the king alone; nay, some of them complain, that the king was not fully enough apprized of all the tendencies of the bill. So that, according to these writers, laws originate with the king. If this be the case, what pretty fables are those, which De Lolme, Paley, Blackstone, and others have written about the constitution of England; and about those fine *checks* and *balances* that exist in the *three branches* of the legislative power! ——As to the merits of the bill itself, all that I shall say now is what I have said before, that if the Hanoverians are worthy of being entrusted with commands in an army, stationed in this kingdom, I can see no reason at all why any class of our fellow subjects should be therefrom excluded. But, every thing will, doubtless, work together for good. Only let us be patient and prudent, faithful and brave, and we shall be a free and happy people.—— In the meanwhile I cannot help, however, indulging, for a little, in that train of melancholy reflection, into which the intelligence of this event has thrown my mind, and from which it is not in the power of philosophy wholly to withdraw it. To see my Lord of Howick, who was, but only the other day, standing up in the old place and in the old manner of Pitt, calling upon the House to do this, and not to do that, in order to preserve its dignity; to see Mr. Calcraft and General Fitzpatrick, who read so distinctly the several estimates that they have to lay upon the table, their hair so nicely powdered and their gloves so genteely drawn off from one hand at a time, while they occasionally press their delicate fingers upon the table, and gracefully bow to the honourable gentlemen on the other side, receiving and most richly meriting the thanks of the smooth Mr. George Johnstone and his like; to see my Lord Henry Petty, who, backed and cheered by a daily increasing brood of "young friends," equal, in every qualification, to those of Pitt, and anxious, like them, to prove their natural attachment to the country, by drawing their nourishment from her paps, has brought forth and propounded to the House such magnificent plans of finance, occupying a bulk of book larger than the Bible; to see Mr. Whitbread, who, after years of study upon the means of filling the hungry bellies of the poor, had, at last, come forward with his spelling-books and his badges and his *bank* (lord save us!) for depositing their fortunes, while Mr. Malthus was in the lobby with his auxiliary scheme for the *checking of all population,* except that of placemen and pensioners; to see the number, the swarms, of new dependents and expectants, who were, but yesterday, the most blithe of God's creatures: to see these, all these, hurled at once from their enjoyments and their hopes; to contemplate the confusion in the daily-press offices, from the uncertainty of the proprietors and editors as to which side they shall take; to think, only to think of the quantity of hartshorn and of gin that must be absolutely necessary to keep up the spirits of disappointed wives and mistresses. Really it is too much for one to support without the aid of a glass of wine, and, accordingly, I have taken one to day, for the first time since the Westminster Election.——"Fired at the "sound, my genius spreads her wings," and I do feel, I must confess, some consolation in the prospect of another Westminster Election; for, if the ministry resign, that is to say, are turned out, I dare say, his Majesty, with his usual paternal goodness, will afford his loving subjects another opportunity of choosing their representatives. This will be a great good. An unmixed good. A good indisputable. A good that will make up for many and many an evil.——In this state of mind I wait, with resignation, for the arrival of the next lying newspaper.

HANOVERIANS.——It is with great satisfaction, that I have just perceived, that, if the

newspapers do not delude me with false hopes, these troops *are going abroad* to fight against the French. I do hope, that there will be no contrary winds. It is now blowing from the South West, and that it may continue in that quarter is my sincere prayer, until these gallant troops come within reach of our enemy, and have a chance of dealing him some deadly blows, as a preliminary to the re-conquest of their own dear country.——How happy they must be at going! What a pleasure it must be to them to have so fair a prospect of speedily participating in the "*deliverance of Europe*," as the Morning Chronicle calls it, and as it will not call it any more, if Mr. Perry should be turned out of place, which he will not, if he can possibly help it! Send them a fine voyage and great success, say I. May they never cease to fight, until they have delivered Europe; and the Englishman who does not join in this prayer must be the very basest of mankind.

CORRESPONDENTS.——Such is my arrear in this way, and such the state of my engagements, that I must say a word or two to correspondents, though contrary to my rule.—All those who have honoured me with communications, some of them a good while ago, may be assured, that they shall be inserted as soon as possible.——The present double number contains *six* letters. Two upon the *Poor-laws*, one of which is MR JOHN BONE's. There is one letter from Major Cartwright to Mr. Windham, upon the *Military Defence* of the country. One from Mr. Capel Lofft, upon I shall not know what until the skill of my printers in decyphering hands writing have enabled me to read it through without the loss of a day's time; but which, from the first sentence indicating that the whole is against myself, I conclude not to contain any thing to "pain any other person's feelings." In answer, however, to the complaint made against me in this sentence; a complaint, that I have neglected the productions of this gentleman, while he has had a polite attention paid to him by all the other periodical publications of the day, I must beg leave to say a few words. I have received, in all, *three* communications from Mr. Capel Lofft. The first, upon my word, I was unable to read. The second was a *poetical* performance, or, it was, at least, placed in lines, as every thing which is called poetry, generally is; and, as it professed, in the title of it, to be in honour of the gallant Lord Nelson, I sent it, without reading it, to my editor, for insertion; but he, being a Norfolk man, came to me, all the way from Panton Square to Fulham, with an expostulation against my lending my pages to the dishonouring of the memory of his famous countryman with doggerel. To the earnestness of this expostulation I gave way; but, I offered the piece to the editor of the POETICAL REGISTER, by whom also *it was rejected*. Now, I appeal to the reader whether Mr. Capel Lofft's charge against me be just ——There are, in the present number, two letters upon the "*Learned languages;*" and, as I have *thirteen* more already by me, it will be impossible to insert them all by *Lady Day* next, which, as the reader will remember, was the time appointed for the learned bodies to close their defence of their calling. I will, therefore, extend the time, until *May Day*; but, with this distinct notification, that I will insert no letter upon the subject, which does not reach me on, or before, that day. There is nothing more irksome than a discussion drawled out; and, therefore, when May Day has arrived, my intention is to answer, as well as I am able, all and singular the arguments that have been, or that shall, before that day, be urged against my propositions; but, when I have done that, my resolution is, not to write any more myself, nor to convey to the public the writings of any other persons, upon the subject.——There is a correspondent, who complains of my *filling up*, as he calls it, my pages with *public and other official* papers, which, he says, he reads, long before, in the newspapers. But, he does not seem to consider, that these newspapers soon go to the lighting of candles and of pipes and to the wrapping up of the lace and muslin which servant maids steal from their mistresses; and that the official documents will need to be referred to, when what I myself write will have been forgotten, or, at least, have become useless.

ON THE BASIS, NATURE, AND LIMITS OF THE RIGHT OF CONQUEST.

SIR;—I have little hope of your inserting my letter: for although during my life, from a very early age, I have at all times been attentive to politics, as one of the first of studies, and one of the chief duties of those who have leisure and the means of considering such subjects, and have in very numerous instances, laid my thoughts before the public for many years, and in various periodical papers, you, and you *alone*, have uniformly rejected them.—I should not, therefore, at this time, or perhaps at any, have written to you again, if any other person had appeared in your paper in answer

to a part of your paper of the 20th Dec. last. —I shall state it in your own words. "The "right, the indisputable right, of making "conquests, exists at all times, in all "nations, and in all cases, except forbidden "by some positive compact, into which the "conquering nation has previously entered. "In fact, arms are, after all, the reasons of "nations."—My objection is, that upon a most important subject this proposition is at once indefinitely and erroneously stated: that the only exception admitted is in reality inapplicable to the subject: and that were it not revolting by its unbounded latitude and obvious ill tendencies, hardly any proposition could be likely more to mislead, and to a more pernicious extent.—It is impossible to state a proposition more positively: and scarcely possible to state any practical proposition so extensively. And I think, hardly any proposition can be imagined more unfounded, or in its natural construction more inconsistent with the peace, order, and security of society.—It is stated, without any exception, but that of *positive compact*. Now *positive compact* is in those cases only necessary to create an obligation to do or forbear a thing, when *previously* to compact the act *would* have been *lawful*. It requires no compact to make *robbery* and *murder* and *tyranny* unlawful. Were a highwayman to present a pistol to your breast, you would be little satisfied by his informing you, that he had made you no promise or agreement not to take your property by force, or your life. And this would be equally true if two men were to meet in a desert, where neither were subject to any positive human law, and both were ignorant of any divine law. Against such acts the law of nature and reason (which is the law of heaven written in our hearts) interposes; with the aid of no other compact than that universally implied compact, that one being shall not injure another; shall not do as it would feel it unjust were another to do against itself. We are bound universally to do good: and, therefore, much more to forbear evil to one another. And, can it, without the most perfect absurdity, be said, that there universally exists a right to do that, which to resist, you yourself represent as an universal right and duty? And as the aggregate of national injury which one country can do to another, is, as it were, infinitely greater than that which one individual can, the duty of abstaining from national injury is heightened in proportion.—Add to this, that conquests are very dissimilar to disquisitions made by individuals in a settled society. So that your suggestions, that it is as lawful for nations to *conquer*, as it is for individuals to *acquire* property and renown, has no principle of analogy to support it. The individual is *not* permitted to gain property by *force*; and, if in private instances of acquisition he should seek to add renown to property by force, he would find the extreme of punishment and of infamy.—Think a moment with yourself what the state of society would be if conquest, in all nations, at all times, and in all cases, (therefore to the extent of one overpowering nation making a conquest of the whole earth, and those of the conquered nations reconquering upon it, and upon each other, whence, and how, and to what extent they could,) were an universally acknowledged right, consequently held as lawful as it is to *eat* or *breathe;* unhappily, the practice of nearly all nations, when they have had the opportunity and the power, has very greatly resembled this: but all nations have condemned it when practised by any but themselves. We have not, and we never can, come to the length, while society exists, and man is man, of admitting an unlimited right of conquest as an universal and indisputable right.—If it be said that your proposition means that *wars* are *not* universally *just*, but that *when* they are commenced, conquest to *any* extent, *will* be just under them, this will not be true. The conquest will be no otherwise just than the war which gave occasion to it was: on that side on which the war is *unjust* every conquest is an aggravation of the injustice. And even on that on which the war is most clearly just in its commencement, the *right* of conquest is *not* an unlimited right.——As to the exception, which by you is stated as the sole one, *positive compact*, it is manifest war and conquest cannot be previously *forbidden* by compact. For though, when war ceases, compact may regulate its consequences, and arrange means of security to retard its renewal, this is all it can do. Compact and force being reciprocally *contraries:* so that when force begins, compact ceases; and conversely.—On the principles of the law of nature, within which, as their common basis, the law of nations is necessarily included, war then only is just when it is founded in necessary self-defence. It is unjust when acquisition or glory are its motives. It is unjust, even when necessary in its commencement, if continued, or advantage made of it, beyond the limits of just indemnity and security. The acquisitions of nations are like those of individuals. Fraud and rapine are alike unwarrantable in either. Free compact, or peaceful and uninjurious *improvement* by skill and labour, are the proper and only

authorised sources of acquirement in its full extent. *Just acquirement by war* extends no farther than *compensation for such injuries suffered by the war* as are in their nature compensable, *and security against future.* This is fully and distinctly laid down by VATTEL: * whom the great Lord MANSFIELD was accustomed to distinguish as the *best* writer on the *Law of Nations.*—— The effect of *treaties,* as to *war,* is merely this—*to quiet possession*; for the sake of the *general peace* of nations. Not to render *conquests* unlawful; for these are always contrary to the law of nations, if they do not spring from just necessity; or if they exceed the just and reasonable limits already stated. But as these limits cannot be strictly ascertained, and as it is for the general interest of nations, that when a war is terminated, and conditions of peace settled by treaty, those conditions should be observed. Treaties are made, not as *positive* compacts to bind a nation not to conquer (for treaties were *cobweb bonds,* indeed, to confine the *tiger* war) but to fix what conquest shall be returned, exchanged, or absolutely surrendered, even suppose a *case of treaty,*—that one nation shall not make war on a third. It does not affect the right of war between that nation so restrained and the third: for neither, independently of treaty, would have been justified in being the aggressor against the other: but it merely furnishes means and facilities, and, therefore, rights of interference in favour of the third; which, without the treaty, the nation so disposed to interfere, would not have possessed in the same manner. This I might have called a *casus fœderis:* and even this will be far from saving your proposition, though it bears the nearest seeming application to it.—But, I have not troubled you with technical terms of the law of nations. You see, Sir, that I have not incumbered this letter with a term of the gallipot (as you call it) though of the most pure and elegant Latinity, the *uti possidetis.* At the same time, I am no enemy to *fixt* terms in negociations, whether in *Latin,* or in any language. And, I think, a language common to all learned bodies precisely the fittest from which to take such terms: and to employ them in preference to terms which one party may understand better than another. And the rather, as in a living language the import of words is always fluctuating. In the use of a *dead* language (perhaps you will be jocular on the term) I think there is no pedantry, (if used on proper occasions), but much propriety. And if pedantry be the undue value of that knowledge which we possess, and the employing of it in ridicule and unjust depreciation of that which we do not possess, (and no man can possess all desireable knowledge) these may be pedantry, and a very mischievous friend of it, in depreciating the dead languages. A proof of the propriety of the use of such terms, as those supply, arises most powerfully from the late negociation itself. All the disputes concerning what the real basis of it, in its commencement, was arising from the want of a fixed and definite term equally understood on both sides, and mutually adopted.—That the governments on both sides were sincere for peace, I take this opportunity of declaring myself fully persuaded. I think the terms progressively offered by France, and the circumstances in which they were offered, place this out of all doubt on her side. And, I think the wise, ingenious, pacific language, character and conduct of Mr. Fox, places it equally out of doubt on ours. And to me Lord Yarmouth seems not merely justified, but to have acted with a judgment, a promptitude, and a resolution, worthy of great respect in a sudden, delicate, and most arduous crisis. I speak this as a perfect stranger to him: but not to the negociation; which I have most attentively read. Had both sides said explicitly in the outset, we agree to take the *uti possidetis* as the basis, or we do not agree, or had settled any other basis in diplomatic language equally definite, it could at least not have been matter of any difficulty to ascertain which side to impute a departure from the basis. Lord Lauderdale I sincerely respect: but, this I must say, that I think there *was* an *opening* upon which there was reasonable hope of terminating the war by a peace honourable and satisfactory to us and to France; and which ought, under all the circumstances, to have been so to Russia; and, therefore, likely to have been *permanent.* The great mind of Mr. Fox, alike imbrued with classic wisdom, and the best information of our own times, saw and took his ground accordingly, that no peace could be expected to be permanent, which should be dishonourable or injurious to any of the contracting parties. But we were not to expect to carry every thing which our ally might wish, or might be supposed by us to make a point of carrying at our risque and expense. And I deeply deplore if we have so entangled ourselves (after such and so recent and multiplied experience of foreign alliances) that we could

* Law of Nations on the Principles of the Law of Nature. Anno. 1760. G. II. ch. xiii. § 1, 2.

not do what was best for ourselves and the world, in the present unexampled situation of Europe, on account of our engagement to this ally.—This I thought previously to Mr. Whitbread's clear, powerful, and, as I apprehend, decisively argumentative speech. And, I am happy, that, as to the latter part at least you think so too. That no expression should have been introduced into the address, which by unnecessary censure might increase the impediments to a renewal of the negociation, and oppose a bar to that peace which it is the common interest and duty of all to suffer no prejudice, partiality, or passion to obstruct.——I am, Sir, &c.—CAPEL LOFFT.—*Froston, near Bury, Suffolk.*

POOR LAWS.

SIR,—The liberal system which you have adopted, of making your Register a medium of free discussion for subjects of national utility, I hope will secure me the speedy insertion of a few remarks upon a letter, which your correspondent C. S. has done me the honour to address to me, in your paper of the 11th inst.--In requesting this favour, however, it is by no means my intention to trouble you with an essay of sufficient length, to dignify it with the appellation of an answer to C. S.; my only object in writing being to exculpate myself from a charge that he has obliquely thrown out against me, and to divest my plan of a character, that must necessarily be imputed to it, if his strictures were to remain unnoticed.——I do not complain that your correspondent has misquoted me, or that he has not fairly reasoned the passage that he has quoted, but I cannot help thinking, that if he had read the context attentively, he would have seen that his objections were both unnecessary and ill-timed.—When the letter alluded to represents me to have asserted "*dogmatically*," "that it would evidently be for the "interest of the Institution" (called TRANQUILLITY, which I have proposed to the public) "to keep up the price of labour, by "the same means that the merchant uses "in favour of his goods, and the farmer of "his stock—withhold it from market"—it can hardly be supposed that the writer had any design of representing me, as *desirous of exciting a mutiny among the labouring classes, against the other classes of the community*; and yet your readers must possess a much greater portion of sagacity than any one of them whom I am acquainted with does possess, if, knowing no more of my object than they could gather from this abstract position, they can possibly have formed any other opinion. Now, Sir, the truth is, that I do not look with a grudging eye, to either merchants, farmers, or ministers of state, though I look with compassion upon the houseless and shivering wretch, whom a wise and just policy would regard as an object equally worthy of its solicitude. Had C. S. evinced the same acuteness, in examining the real tendency of my plan, as he has in combating the imaginary theory that he has attributed to me, he would have learned, that there is an amazing difference between increasing the comforts of one part of the community, and diminishing those of another; and that it is equally as mischievous to force labour upon the market unnecessarily, as it is to withhold it when it is required.—If I understand the object of this letter right, it is designed to prove, that there is not a sufficient number of useful labourers employed, to produce all the comforts and happiness that the soil and population of the country is capable of producing; and this is so clearly my own opinion, that I could not attempt to controvert the general argument of C. S. without contradicting myself. "No "plan," says your correspondent, "can "succeed in reducing the poor's rate, but "such as will convert multitudes of the "idlers, who compose our *unproductive*, "into *useful*, labourers, and furnish them "with land to work upon." And I am so clearly convinced of this truth, that the passage from which the quotation cited by him was taken, was written expressly to prove that a systematic arrangement ought to be adopted, for the purpose of procuring employments for *all persons* willing to maintain themselves by their industry. The particular apprehensions of C. S. appear to be excited by a fear, that too great a number of persons is employed in the management of the circulating medium, or, as he calls it, the coinage division of labour; but surely he will not attempt to persuade the public, that the national prosperity would be in the smallest degree promoted, by throwing these people out of their present occupations, for the mere purpose of reducing them to a state of dependence upon the charity of their friends. Yet such must be the tendency of reducing the number of persons employed in any of the occupations commonly called useless, until that most important of all facts to the political economist be ascertained—What quantity of labour is sufficient, in a given population, to supply necessaries in abundance for the whole? and until, in consequence of the information so obtained, some means be adopted to furnish employment for the *whole of the labour* not necessary to such supply.—I have read the letter

of your correspondent with great attention, but I have found it utterly impossible to convince myself that the public would be in the smallest degree benefited by the controversy, or even by the decision of the question, Whether, in certain cases, it might not be good policy to prevent too much labour from being forced upon the market; for there are so many previous inquiries that must necessarily be answered, before this question can possibly arise, that we should be going too far into the trackless expanse of conjecture, to render either of our theories useful.—If, however, I beg your correspondent to excuse me for not weighing his various *suppositions* with that nicety which their ingenuity entitles them to, I shall not think any such apology necessary for taking advantage of some *concessions* that he has made, and which being more of a practical nature, will be better understood. "I do admit," he says (column 559), "that the "balance of power between the labourer "and the employer, which is aimed at in "your plan, must be established;" and he adds (column 568), "till the laws of la-"bour secure to the labourer that portion "of food, raiment, &c. which is necessary "to prolong his life and health, the number "of poor must continue to increase." Now, Sir, this doctrine coming from a gentleman who avows himself to be a revolutionist, affords me much satisfaction, as it induces me to hope, that a numerous fraternity, which has hitherto been content to pursue the multiform phantoms of its own fancy, may in time be prevailed upon to unite with those vulgar beings, who wish to see some *real* reforms take place.—The doctrine of *this* revolutionist is strictly true; and if he is in the habit of attending any of the public assemblies or halls, where his lofty brethren are accustomed to harangue the people, it may not be asking too great a favour, to request him to exert a little of the ingenuity displayed in his letter, to prevail upon them, if possible, to reduce some of their threadbare theories to practice. They have been such edifying instructors, that the people have a vast desire to see what sort of workmen they would make. C. S. does not appear deficient of zeal in the cause, and he certainly does not want argument when he is once fairly set a going; if, then, he values his revolutionary relationship, on account of any opportunity it affords him of giving effect to his theories, I would recommend him to read his copy of the "Outline of a "Plan for reducing the Poor's Rate," at the next assembly, and not direct the attention of his friends to any detached passage, but endeavour to interest them in the *general* object.—I do not consider this asking any favour of C. S. for he has evidently misunderstood the passage that he has quoted; and if in the first instance it was worth reading, it is now worth re-considering in connexion with the context.—Your readers, Sir, will easily see, that I should be grossly misappropriating time by entering upon this discussion, if you will permit me to state the leading objects of my plan, as introductory to the passage alluded to.—I have endeavoured to prove to the public, that the poor's rate is an unjust and unnecessary impost, which operates at once as a scourge to the industrious and careful, and a bribe to the idle and profligate; that, instead of being a credit to the country, it is a disgrace and a nuisance, and ought to be abolished. But though your correspondent will only allow me to have the same talent as a parrot, that of being able to chatter, without considering what I say, I happened accidentally, when I published this opinion, to be aware with him, that reforms might be so injudiciously applied, "as to make bad worse;" and therefore I suggested a mean of effecting that abolition in a way so gradual and slow, that its removal should be attended with no inconvenience.—It is a circumstance particularly favourable to the abolition, that no description of persons is strongly attached to the poor's rate; and it is still more so, that among the poor great numbers of them are willing to provide for themselves another way; so that it is even possible, that both the government and the people may, upon this occasion, be of one mind.—The measnre that I propose, and which I am endeavouring to get adopted, is, to afford persons, with the very smallest incomes, an opportunity of depositing whatever they can spare, at all convenient times, and whether it be little or much, in an economical bank, to be under the guardianship of the most respectable persons that can be prevailed upon to become its trustees; and, in order to encourage persons to provide for age in this way, during the seasons of youth and vigour, I think *the Legislature ought to exempt persons, so providing for themselves, from parish assessments on account of the poor.* It is not enough to say, that the Legislature would act equitably by granting this indulgence, a very hasty consideration of the subject is

sufficient to satisfy any honest mind, that *the Legislature would be unjust, if it were to refuse it*; for the natural tendency of the poor's rate, as it operates at present, is to occasion more poverty than it relieves: and the people would be infinitely better off, if Parliament would be obliging enough to let them take care of themselves. This will be quite evident, if we consider the situation of forty poor housekeepers who commence a club for old age, under the delusive promises of Mr. Rose's Bill "for the relief," as it professes, "of Friendly Societies." Relying upon the credit and honour of Parliament, that they shall be both "encouraged "and relieved," if they raise a fund for their mutual relief in old age, according to the provisions of the bill, the poor men contrive (by abridging themselves and families of fifty shillings worth of comforts—often of necessaries) to contribute fifty shillings each to the said fund. This fifty shillings is, in many instances, all that they can possibly spare, without exhausting that health and strength, upon which alone they can rely for the means of continuing their occupations; for if they could spare ten shillings more, they would make ten shillings worth more provision for age; and no system, that deserves to be called either wise or just, would require a people to exert themselves beyond their powers. But mark how the present poor laws act.—As soon as the poor man has paid his fifty shillings to his club, the collector of the poor's rate attacks him for thirty shillings, and the man and his wife, who have been depriving themselves of comforts in order to provide for their own distresses, are now obliged to deprive their children of necessaries, in order to provide for the profligacy of others. The effects of these grinding exactions are, that, after a few years, persons of this description are incapable of continuing the double expense; and as it does not always happen that the overseers are persons of either feeling or prudence enough to see what course would be the most proper to be taken upon such occasions, they insist upon having the poor's rate at all risks, which leaves the poor people no choice, but to adjourn the contributions to their clubs, where the iniquitous principle of forfeiture, contrived by those make-shift institutions, for the purpose of swindling and oppressing the *poorest* of their members, obliges them at last to abandon the whole of what they have saved, through an inability to make their payments punctually. Repeated instances have occurred, where the chagrin and mortification consequent upon these unsuccessful efforts, have converted the most diligent and sober amongst the people into idlers the most negligent and debauched, who, without having defined their own feelings, seemed to be governed by a determination, that if the parish would not suffer them to make provision for themselves, they would not deprive themselves of a single glass of spirits, or any sensual gratification, for the sake of providing for others. Thus the overseers are *at last* obliged to go without their rates; and after they have, by selling their furniture and various other kinds of persecution, driven the people from a house to a garret, and from a garret to the parish funds, they libel the hard-worked and ill-fed poor of England, as a spendthrift and incorrigible race, for whom the half-starved charity of a parish workhouse is too good.—I understand it is intended to introduce a Bill into Parliament, in the course of the next session, to oblige people employing workmen and servants to stop three farthings or a penny per week out of their wages, for the purpose of making a future provision of some sort for them.—Should such a design really be entertained, I would seriously advise the Members of both Houses to read their Bibles beforehand, as it may afford them much instruction to learn from high authority, that persons may *weary themselves for very vanity*. Parliament certainly ought to pause before it adopts any more *compulsory* measures, after being aware, that notwithstanding all the discouragements of the present system, there are 704,000 persons in the kingdom associated *voluntarily* to provide for their future wants, by the best means that have *yet* been proposed to them. If this disposition receive all the encouragement it asks, it will effect every thing that the nature of things will admit towards improving the condition of the people, and it can hardly fail of success, unless Parliament should attempt *to govern too much*.—This remark characterizes the true nature of the dispute between your correspondent and me. He is of opinion that Government ought to interfere with every thing; and that instead of allowing the workman to get all the wages that he may think his services entitled to, "the right of "every man to do as he pleases with his "own property" should be taken from all classes without distinction, even so far as to dictate to every person what particular profession he should follow; whereas, I am endeavouring to prove, not only that labour and property ought to be left to find their own value, but that the possessors of both ought to be subject to even less controul in the disposal of them than they now are. I

do not deny that we have both the same ends in view; I admit that it is only about the means that we differ. He wishes to accomplish his end by means of a "Society for the *Suppression of Vice*;" I wish to accomplish the same end by means of a society for the *reward of virtue*.—With a view to accomplish my purpose, I tell every poor person (and I am always ready to prove it to every person that will take the trouble to examine my calculation) that a payment of five pounds at the age of 21, and two shillings paid weekly till the age of 56, will provide him an annuity of fifty pounds from thence, till the end of life, with an annuity of thirty-three pounds to his widow, if he should leave one at his death, after that period. Now it will doubtless surprize those libellers, who talk of the labouring people as being too far gone to be mended, and too worthless to deserve help, to be told, that there are some thousands of persons, with very trifling dependencies, who are anxiously waiting to subscribe to such a fund, as soon as some nobleman or person of consideration can be found, who will think it worth his while to give his countenance to the measure, for the *mere simple* and *unaffected* honour of presiding over the interests of the people, and doing good without noise and tumult. Those who call themselves *men of the people, friends of the people*, and the like, would do well to ask their consciences, whether they ought not to assist the people in securing their comfort and independence in this way, in preference to relying upon the all-corrupting aid of parish charity. According to Mr. Rose, the keep of a poor person in a parish workhouse costs twelve pounds and three farthings per annum; and according to my calculation, a subscription of sixpence per week, from the age of twenty till fifty-six, would secure an annuity of a larger amount; so that if the people would but refrain from three glasses of spirits in a week, and deposit the value in this fund, they might make a better provision for themselves than they would find in the workhouse, without being beholden to charity.—Sir, I think the people could not adopt this course long, without greatly improving their condition; and I think that those apostles of public virtue and reform, who talk to the people about liberty and independence, can claim very little merit for the value of their professions, if they do not assist in the establishment of this institution, and encourage the people to embrace the advantages it affords them.—This proposal takes it for granted that the people have some surplus, after the whole of their absolute wants are supplied; but as I am opposed by the incontrovertible truth, that great numbers of the people are reduced to the most helpless state of misery and wretchedness, for want of being able to find employments, I propose to associate with my institution a general register-office, under the patronage of the nobility, gentry, merchants, tradesmen, and friends of improvement of every description, to which persons seeking employments of every species shall be at liberty to apply, and where, by the aid of system and intelligence of arrangement, every fact may be ascertained connected with the difficult problem—How can the whole people be employed, with the greatest advantage to the state?—To arrive at any conclusion upon this point, it is necessary to take some immediate steps to facilitate the means of communication between persons requiring services and those who are willing to engage in employments; for at present we have no means of determining, whether any one profession be deficient of, or overstocked with hands; whether there really is employment enough to occupy the whole people; or whether beggary and idleness be the consequence of necessity or neglect. This is, in my opinion, the A. B. C. of the political economist; and until we have learned this lesson, all further discussion upon the subject of labour will rather deserve the character of an idle amusement, than an useful inquiry.—To conclude these observations, I wish it to be understood, that I by no means intend to shrink from the discussion, whenever the state of things shall render it necessary; but adhering to what I have written in the passage of my "Outline," from which C. S. has taken his quotation, I shall limit my endeavours for the present to the establishment of the institution, as being more immediately called for by the wants of the people. I must therefore repeat in this place, that, "as there is much reason to "believe that the distresses of the people "do not arise so much out of the scarcity "of employments, as out of the defects in "the means of procuring them, it would "be a waste of time to descant upon the "means of remedying an evil that may not "exist."—That I may not appear unthankful for the compliment that C. S. is pleased to pay me, "as a fellow labourer in the same vineyard," I would beg leave to solicit his co-operation in the establishment of an institution, which he acknowledges is calculated "to render the people independent of parochial charity;" and I flatter myself that he will see the propriety of first pro-

curing employment for all the idlers who are *now* suffering the distresses of wants, of collecting all the waste labour that is scattered abroad in the forms of beggary and vagabondage, and of increasing the amount of agricultural labour, if it should appear necessary, by the hands that are already unemployed, before he attempts to drive any description of persons from the professions in which they are now occupied. Should he, on the contrary, be of opinion, that we ought not to attempt any improvement within our reach, unless we can assure ourselves that we shall arrive at absolute perfection, I shall regret that a person of his talents is left among the number of those frothy reformers, whose volatile theories are only floated out in their declamatory harangues, to excite the giddy admiration of a mob; but judging from the nature of the case, I shall, as it regards myself, reject as much as possible all discussions *purely* speculative, and endeavour, if I can, to prevail upon my countrymen to embrace reform in a "tangible shape."——I am, Sir, your's, JOHN BONE.—*Office of Tranquillity, Albion-Street, Blackfriars, 17th Oct.* 1806.

POOR LAWS.

SIR,——Having made the condition of the above class of my fellow creatures the only political subject of my studies; and having, by every possible means within my reach, endeavoured to fix public attention on the cause of their wretchedness, I am particularly anxious to express my opinion on the bill lately brought into parliament by Mr. Whitbread: and your former indulgencies, with your singular liberality in giving insertion to the well-intended productions of individuals, however humble their merit, induce me to hope that you will permit the expression of that opinion to reach the public in the ranks of the numerous and invaluable articles which appear in the Political Register.——Mr. Whitbread's hope of success seems to rest itself upon the advantages of Education to the Poor, and upon that of a Funding System which they can call their own. He is informed, that the poor of Scotland can read and write, and that the workhouses in that learned land are not so numerous, in proportion to its population, as they are in the unlettered districts of England and Wales; and hence he appears to infer, that the enviable disproportion arises from the superior education of my poor learned brethren of ancient Caledonia: for, I see no harm in hinting, that I am a Scotchman by birth, parentage, and education; and one, too, I would willingly flatter myself, in whom there is no guile; particularly on the subject of my inquiry. The advantages of education to all classes of people are too self-evident to admit of a doubt in any other mind than that of those who would perpetuate ignorance, that they may plunder with impunity; but, like every other acquisition, its advantages are governed by circumstances, and therefore it can only be a remedy in the particular case in which the want of it is the cause of the evil complained of. Consequently, to apply it in any other would be irrational, and even mischievous, so far as it was the means of neglecting the application of the remedy that belongs to the case. And I flatter myself, I shall be able to satisfy my readers, that the subject of my title cannot be viewed in a more favourable, if in so favourable a light. Mr. Whitbread has adduced no argument that I have seen, to shew that the calamities of the poor of England arise from their ignorance of letters; he has only assumed, in the same unsupported-by-argument manner, that the poor of Scotland are better off, and that their learning is the cause of it; and, upon this baseless fabric of a vision he attempts to rear a system which is to ameliorate the condition of millions of the most useful members of society! O! blind leader of the blind! Education, however, is of use to the Scotch poor; it enables them to understand what is passing in other countries, and they emigrate in the pursuit of it, as naturally as the spark flies upwards. Is this the effect which our reforming schemer would produce by instructing the poor of England? Would he, too, as well as Mr. Malthus, the divine, thin or check population? Well! be it so; but let him favour us with the proof of his sense of moral and political justice and prudence, if he would. But is he correct in his conclusion from the advantages of education? Are the poor of Scotland better off, in point of comforts, than those of England? To this question I can speak from my own past knowledge, as well as from present authorities who cannot be deceived, who have no interest in mis-stating the case, and whom, therefore, I cannot suspect of the intention to exaggerate. On these grounds I can verify it upon oath, that I have known packs of hounds in England that are fed upon better food, and supplied with a better allowance of it, than generally falls to the lot of the poor; and that are lodged in a far better manner than that in which the poor are kenneled, particularly in the northern and western districts of my native country. Animal food of any kind is, it may be said, totally out of their reach; of barley meal they sel-

dom have sufficiency to satisfy their hunger; of clothes, of the coarsest of their own manufactory, they generally have not enough to cover their nakedness; and as to habitations, hog-sties in England offer an equal, if not a better protection against the inclemency of the weather, and the intrusions of noxious animals. Seldom a shower of rain falls which does not penetrate the scoty roofs of their turf-thatched huts; and which after traversing and tarnishing their care-carved faces, and descending from the chequered rags in which they lie, ascends again to their skins through the scanty morsel of straw that forms the bed on the earthen floor of the apartment in which they sleep.—These are facts which will not be denied, by those of my learned country who have no motive of interest for denying them, and no reason to be ashamed as the authors of them, because they know them to be facts, and general facts too, in the particular districts of Scotland to which I allude. With the state of the poor in the eastern and southern districts, I am not so well acquainted, but I should think that the gradation of climate cannot operate much in their favour. Seeing, then, that the education of the Scotch poor is of no service to them farther than it stimulates them to seek for those comforts in foreign climes, which their own native country unnaturally denies them, it remains with Mr. Whitbread to shew, how it would promote the welfare and security of the British empire, as it rests exclusively on the exertions of a numerous and a happy poor, were it taught to the poor of England. Can Mr. Whitbread be ignorant of the inefficiency and inapplicability of education as a remedy to the political evils and state craft, which manufactures and multiplies the poor? If he be not, will he condescend to shew us, the witnesses of his consistency at the last Westminster election, how the reading of books, or a knowledge of the theories, maxims, and precepts they contain, can enable men of small capitals to secure trade sufficient to support their families, from the unfeeling grasp, of the large capitalists. How such knowledge is to enable an agricultural labourer, who has saved a few pounds, to obtain an acre of land to help to support his family from the avarice of its owner when the agricultural monopoliser, and speculator of "credit and capital" offers double the rent for it, which the other can give. How such knowledge is to enable the limited annuitants and small capitalists to secure their real incomes against the swindling principles of paper circulation, and the depreciation of money. How such knowledge is to enable any class of the community to defend themselves against the unrelenting and unfeeling demands of the tax-gatherer, but by a sheer robbery of the rest, either by the means of a monopoly of, or that of an extortionate price on, the articles in which they deal? And how, when man is thus made and suffered to live upon man, with more than cannibal ferocity, is education to enable the friendless labourer to stand out for the wages which is necessary to secure his independence of parochial charity? These, I am confident, and not ignorance of letters, are the first links in the great chain of social causes which render the condition of the poor wretched, and the morals of the rich vicious examples for them to follow. But, as to the immediate cause, as resulting from the first, it appears to me to be, that the number of those who are annually employed in useful labour, bears too small a proportion to that of those who are not so employed; or, in Mr. Whitbread's own terms, that the number of men who live upon men, bears too great a proportion to that of the men on whom they live. By a calculation which I have made, and for which, with the data thereof, I refer to the Political Register of the 23d of August, 1806, p. 295, it appears that the number of men-eaters bears the proportion of about 4-fifths, to that of the men who are annually eaten in England and Wales: that is, that the maintenance, in luxuries and necessaries, of the whole population of those parts of the united kingdoms, is made to fall upon about a fifth part of its number, by means of the numberless stratagems by which the men-eaters, of social order and religion, slip their heads out of the halters of productive industry, and live in idleness upon the industry of others. I do not, however, deny the necessity and policy of "man living upon man," but when four members live upon one man, as from the calculation to which I allude they appear to do, I am inclined to dispute both the policy and necessity of the case. As to the necessity of the case, I shall totally deny it, until some arguments are made use of to convince me of the contrary, and that I apprehend will never be made. And, as to the policy of it, I dispute it upon two grounds: first; because I cannot conceive how the exertions of one man, can properly supply the wants of five, including himself; and if I could, I would insist upon the injustice of the case, on the clear ground of unjustifiable oppression, or, excess of labour; and, second, because I see by ocular demonstration, that the whole of the labouring poor, and multitudes of those who live upon their labour

are equally destitute of sufficiency of the common necessaries of life, to preserve their healths and prolong their lives; and that, in old age and infirmity, they have no alternative but to starve with hunger and cold, or linger out their miserable existence in that parochial grave of morals and industry, called the workhouse, which those who omissively or commissively skinned them, have prepared for their bones. I am, therefore, decidedly of opinion, that the poor cannot settle with the rich and the idle, on the principle of the *uti possidetis*, if that be a more intelligible term than *actual possession*; that any project which is sincerely set on foot for the amelioration of their condition, must contain in itself the sure and certain means of diminishing the number of idlers, and increasing that of the industrious; and of dividing the subjects on which their wants direct them to labour, on more equitable principles than those that are at present in practice. 'Till, then, this intention appears clear from their schemes, I shall be compelled, with sorrow, to consider all projectors, whatever may be their rank or station in life, as men who either know not their subject, or, have sinister motives in the pursuit of it. I cannot dismiss this subject, without making a few remarks upon Mr. Whitbread's "Poor's fund, and Assurance office." Abstractedly considered, the utility of these institutions cannot be called in question, for every view that can be taken of the case, operates in their favour; but, can they be made practically useful under all the circumstances of the case? Can they be made to reach or remove any one of the causes of pauperism which I have pointed out, or produce the effect of the general remedy which I have just suggested, or lend any aid to produce it? I do not expect that any one will attempt to answer these questions or any of them in the affirmative. But, admitting the ability of the labourers to fund a part of their earnings, who, let me ask Mr. Whitbread, is to pay the annuity it yields, when they are past labour? By which I mean, who is to supply them with food and raiment, &c. when they have lost the ability of supplying themselves? Will idlers strip and work to do it? Will gentlemen's servants in livery, and out of livery do it? Will soldiers and sailors, placemen and pensioners do it? If these, or neither of them will, the labourers must; and if they must, I am at a loss to discover, what they would gain by supporting the aged and infirm poor as annuitants that they now lose by supplying them in the workhouse. In either case, they have the scanty reward of their labour and no more; and whether they are paid it by the keeper of the workhouse or the tenants of it left at liberty, can make no difference in their case; I should therefore be glad to know, what is the utility of this minor funding scheme? But, as it has a tendency to illustrate the nature and utility of funding systems in general, I must observe, that it appears to me, that this alternate reformer of the Parliament and the People, and yet no reformer at all, does not sufficiently distinguish between real and nominal funds to know what he is about. Could he invent a fund that would preserve the real savings of labour, that is not money, but the food and raiment, &c. which labour alone creates, and which the labourer may be able to lay by; then, indeed, his funding scheme would answer his expectation. But, as this is naturally impossible, as the necessaries required within the year, must generally be created within the year by labour and not by money, nominal funds are only bubbles, which make no real provision for adversity, and which must ultimately burst and ruin those who depend upon them, without doing any good to those who do not; unless the ruined dependants be added to the fund of productive labour. From all the views, then, which I am able to take of his plan, I am honestly and unprejudicedly compelled to condemn Mr. Whitbread's scheme as a crude and an undigested notion, which betrays great want of knowledge, and which has no other tendency, than to prevent the application of the remedy which belongs to the evil, till it is too late to apply it.—Dated actually in the cellar, *March* 10*th*, 1807. C. S.——P. S. Having pointed out the necessity, as I conceive, of increasing our number of productive labourers, and of furnishing them with the necessary subjects to labour upon, as the first step towards the amelioration of the condition of the poor, it follows, as a collateral duty, that I should also point out the means of perpetuating to the labourer, and to the state as resting upon the basis of labour; the increase of comforts which the adoption of my plan seems to promise—but, as this article is already too long, I must defer this duty for the present.

NATIONAL DEFENCE.

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM WINDHAM.

LETTER II.

SIR,——As ever since the writing of my letter to you, dated the 30th of November, I have been absent from my own study, and shall for some time longer continue on a cir-

cle of visits and engagements, without an opportunity of referring, except accidentally, to necessary books, I am under great disadvantages in discussing the very important question to our liberties, respecting *a proper military system for our country*. But as, Sir, your military opinions and measures appear to me to be utterly incompatible with national freedom, and leading directly to the entire subversion of the English constitution, I cannot allow myself to keep silence, and shall rather attempt an imperfect opposition than none at all. For succeeding in your system, you have not only the advantage of being a minister in whom apparently is placed an implicit confidence by his colleagues, you have not only the reputation of your own abilities, but you have, of course, in favour of your sentiments, a decided majority in an assembly wherein I never could discover, since the first modern undermining of the military branch of the constitution by Mr. *Pitt* and Mr. *Dundas*, any thing in the smallest degree approaching to a constitutional view of the subject: and, besides all this, you have, what never fails to accompany deep corruptions of a government, a ready aid and support from the voices and the pens of that very numerous class, who always take care to be of the same opinion with men in power. But, Sir, with all these advantages on your side, your case is really so weak, that it will require no great knowledge or skill to expose your system to the disapprobation of persons of sound judgment, who shall prefer truth and freedom to palpable error and political slavery.—I trust, Sir, that in thus opposing your views, and objecting to your measures, I shall not for a moment be suspected of favouring the designs of that remnant of the *Pitt* and *Dundas* faction by whom the present ministry is assailed; for it is only when you shall resemble them, that I shall blame you.——My objection to you in respect of your political *principles*, an objection, Sir, which possibly it may not be in your power to remove, is this, that you do not, as I conceive, admit as the ground-work of just government, the existence of human rights, and are persuaded that all government ought to depend upon the mere judgment and opinion of learned and sagacious men; that CONSTITUTIONS are so far convenient contrivances, that they amuse a people, and serve to keep them in subjection; but may be dispensed with by the rulers themselves, when they conceive such dispensing to be expedient; wherefore such CONSTITUTIONS as are *unwritten* are the best; as they give full scope to perpetual disputation, which is highly favourable to the exercise, to use the words of Mr. *Burke*, of the "*civil discretion*" of profound statesmen and men of genius. If, Sir, in these opinions I wrong you, it is unintentionally, and I shall be extremely happy to acknowledge my mistake the moment I perceive my error. I have however, judged it best for the public interest, plainly to speak my thoughts. If, indeed, your mind and understanding be so constituted as I have judged, then in vain indeed must it be to hold up to you the English constitution, as a rule to you of right conduct; for in the very measures which according to the general apprehension should be flagrant and gross violations of it, you might, agreeably to your own ideas of political morality, be conscientiously acting upon principle as an honest man. If the nation conceive they hold their constitution, not on the tenure of court expediency, or of the "civil discretion" of men of genius, but on the solid foundation of human rights, then it is for them to consider, whether a man who holds the opposite sentiment, and acts upon the contrary principle, is a fit person to administer any part of their government. In my view, it would be as inconsistent for a nation, claiming liberty as a RIGHT, to be governed by a minister in whose creed human rights were not acknowledged, as for a christian community to have for its officiating minister a mahomedan or a pagan. Such mahomedan or such pagan might be a man of genius, of experience and integrity; but he could not be a proper minister for a christian community. That the notions of civil discretion betrayed a late learned and sagacious orator into the wildest inconsistencies in argument and conduct, might be easily proved *; and whenever Mr. *Windham* shall not condescend to take the ENGLISH CONSTITUTION and the principles of CIVIL GOVERNMENT for his guides, he must not hope to escape a like censure. Mr. *Cobbett*, indeed, Sir, tells us you are a sincere friend to the true liberties of your country; but *liberty*, among the asserters to its full extent of the doctrine of "civil discretion" is a word as much without a meaning, as that of *religion* among atheists. Now, as I am accustomed to judge of a tree only by its fruit, I must doubt the fact of your being a friend to the *liberties* of your country; and must continue to doubt until I shall see the manifestation of that fact, in your acknowledgement of those principles, civil and military, of the English constitution, on which our political liberty depends; but, to confess the truth, I cannot but suspect that, equally

with your departed friend, you "hate the very sound" of all such abstract principles, which, according to my recollection, he was pleased to misrepresent, by miscalling them "metaphysical distinctions," and thereby artfully avoided giving those pledges for constitutional conduct which must have resulted from the admission of those principles of the constitution. As, however, the law would be a juggle, and the constitution a cheat, unless they rested on *principles*, so their *principles* will ever command my respect and attachment. Without guarding them at present against petty cavil, it may be concisely affirmed, that *political liberty is only enjoyed by those who make their own laws, and who moreover are at all times systematically armed and trained to war in their defence.* According to this concise definition, before we can allow you to be a friend to the real liberties of your country, we must know you to be an advocate for a substantial reform in the representation of the people in parliament, and for SUCH an arms-bearing of the English nation as necessarily results from those *principles* of our common law which relate to the *posse comitatus* or original militia, and which have been so lucidly unfolded by Sir *William Jones*. These, Sir, are the essentials, the fundamentals, civil and military of our constitution. With these in our possession and enjoyment, all else must be safe; without these, nothing is or can be secure. Observe, Sir, that, although I am not so licentious as to tamper with the principles of political liberty which it has pleased the Deity to make part of the law of nature, I am not contending for these principles being adopted and acted upon to the utmost extent of ideal possibility. I have had sufficient experience of the clamour of the selfish and the silly not unnecessarily to set them in full cry. Give us but, with honesty and sincerity, with a genuine love of liberty, and with an admiration of what is great and good in the science of government, the solid substance of these securities for our liberties, and I shall be content.——With respect, Sir, to your present ideas on the *civil* branch of our constitution, I shall not now make any inquiries, but confine myself to your military notions. These can only be gathered from your parliamentary speeches and legislative measures. On your error, as I esteem it, in labouring to establish a standing army in the highest degree dangerous to our liberties, I have, Sir, in general terms in my letter above referred to, already passed my judgment. Perhaps, Sir, when you shall have completed a standing army according to your ideas of the necessities of the state, and the right conduct of the war, you then intend to proceed more agreeably to the principles of the constitution than hitherto. Should this however be the case, I shall still think you err. You may furnish the instrument of our destruction; you may then be removed from your office, or you may die, and others may use it to subvert our liberties. But, it is not the ill use that may be made of an immense unbalanced standing army, but *its existence*, that is the *proof* of liberty having been lost, and despotism established. As I cannot approve of the establishment of despotism as a prelude to the security of our liberties, so at all events I must hold you to have begun at the wrong end of your work in reforming our military system. I believe also you are as wrong in policy as in principle; and as I can refer you for the grounds of this opinion to *England's Ægis*, where I think it must be seen that when we shall once again become, by the revival of the military branch of the constitution, a martial nation, with never less than *twelve hundred thousand* of the civil state in arms, the regular army must always overflow with recruits, whether bounties should be given or not, I must needs think such a revival of our martial energies ought to have been your first measure, and the foundation of your whole system. I do not so much mean first in time as in principle, for both parts of the system might have gone on hand in hand together, as you have contrived with respect to the two parts of your own system. —In taking a correct view of *a proper military system for our country*, I am in no fear of censure from any one who is a constitutional statesman as well as a soldier, when I divide the necessary force into *defensive* and *offensive*, or into *domestic* and *foreign*, as the case may be. For *defensive* purposes, we should deserve to be conquered if our civil state in arms could not alone set at defiance all the legions of *France* and her allies. For *offensive* purposes, or for defending the dominions of an ally, the regular army is our proper weapon. For all *domestic* services, such as preserving the peace, putting down insurrection, or quelling rebellion, the civil state in arms is the only proper support of the government and asserter of the authority of the laws: all *foreign* services, such as

* For a specimen see THE STATE OF THE NATION, by J. C. published by Jones. See also an appeal, civ. and mil. on Eng. Const. Index, and a letter to Edm. Burke, Esq. published by Wilkie 1775.

forming garrisons, and protecting our distant possessions, whether in war or in peace, belong of course to the regular army. These principles laid down, we have a rule for determining what shall be the strength of the army. It ought to be such as, in the judgment of *a parliament in which the people should have a fair, full, and substantial representation*, should be sufficient for liberally furnishing the demands of offensive war and all other foreign services, and not one man more. The necessary rotation and reserve would always keep at home a considerable force, which in my judgment should form the garrisons of Portsmouth, Plymouth, &c. and from thence disseminate their recruiting parties over the island. As an exception to the general reasoning on a military distribution, I admit that the permanent artillery establishment ought to have a suitable augmentation, for supplying the armed population with gunners *. In no case whatever ought the military state, or standing army, to presume to interfere in keeping the peace, or otherwise to act in support of the civil magistrate, who, with a civil state in arms that might set at defiance all the legions of *France* and her allies, could not possibly need such assistance. Whatever may be forms and appearances, that government whose ultimate resort, for the execution of the law is in a standing army, is *a military government*. A military government is despotism. Were our constitution then fully restored to vigour, the magistrate who should so far betray his trust, as to profane the laws by calling upon a mercenary soldiery to carry them into execution, would be guilty of a crime of no small magnitude, and would merit a punishment of the utmost severity.—If then it be part of the definition of political liberty, that *the people must at all times be systematically armed and trained to war in defence of their laws*, we find that the English constitution, by which such arming and such training is *prescribed*, is in perfect unison with political liberty †. To those who wish to trace to its source the treacherous neglect of this arms-bearing and the first introduction of a standing army, I shall recommend an admirable *discourse on the establishment of a national and constitutional force*, written in 1757 by Mr. *Jenkinson*, now Earl of *Liverpool*; and those who would compare the sterling military energies of the constitution with contemptible counterfeits, may compare *Sir William Jones's Inquiry into the legal Means of suppressing Riot*, as well as *England's Ægis*, with the successive statutes of Mr. *Pitt* and Mr. *Dundas*, Mr. *Addington* and Mr. *Yorke*, Lord *Grenville* and the gentleman to whom this letter is addressed; for their systems of yeomanry, of volunteers, and of non-descripts of the civil state, whom they have severally selected for being trained to arms. In direct contempt of the constitution, and in as direct hostility to the national liberty, the military systems of all alike have consisted in building up an immense standing army as a *permanent* force; and in rendering all arming of the people only *temporary*; a mere provisional force, at *the discretion of the crown*. Although, Sir, those statutes of your predecessors were by express words only in force respectively for the then "present war," or "present hostilities," and so forth, while your own Training Act, 46 Geo. 3, c. 90. has no limitation of time for its continuance, yet as apportioning men to be trained, § 4 is not made obligatory upon, but only "lawful for, his Majesty;" the only real difference in the two cases is, that after the last mentioned statute shall at the *discretion* of the crown have ceased to operate, by the same *discretion* it may again be revived at pleasure; and at all times the number of men within the limit of 200,000, to be trained to arms is likewise wholly in the crown's *discretion*. When we reflect that, by an eternal law of nature, arms-bearing must ever be the distinction between freemen and slaves, it ought to surprise us that, when ENGLISH ministers have seen the necessity of a national arming, for preserving our existence as a people amidst the downfall of states and kingdoms, they should still in all that relates to the arming of Englishman, act with as much jealousy and distrust as when they arm the negroes of *Jamaica*; but, such has from first to last been the fact; and, perhaps, Sir, you will feel it as the strongest satire on your own Training Bill, that it is a twin brother of most correct resemblance, the very counterpart of a new system just introduced under that among the European governments which is the most barbarous and the most despotic, meaning the government of *Russia*. ——You must, Sir, be in possession of the *Russian* state paper which appeared in the Courier newspaper on the 29th ult. under the title there given it of a Manifesto. As the parts of it to which I allude are of importance in the present discussion, I must quote them at some length.—After certain recitals respecting the state of *Europe*, the

* Appeal, civ. and mil. on Eng. Con. 172.

† See England's Ægis. Index.

sudden "downfal of *Prussia*," and the menaces of "an hostile invasion" of *Russia* itself, his Imperial Majesty proceeds,—"At "the commencement of this inevitable war, "the whole burthen of which, after the total overthrow of our allies, devolves upon "*our country*, we consider it our first duty "to redouble our unceasing efforts for the "preservation of the tranquillity and integrity of our empire, by augmenting and "collecting *the armed force of a faithful, brave, and magnanimous people*, entrusted "to our administration by Almighty Providence. The miseries which have so rapidly overtaken *the neighbouring powers*, "evinces the necessity of recourse to unusual means, to great and vigorous measures, which can only be carried into effect by a zealous attachment to our country, by a manly firmness of spirit, and a "true sense of *national honour*. A people "really inspired and actuated by sentiments "of that description, *arming in a body*, "may raise an insurmountable rampart "against every hostile attack, however formidable. Neglect in providing for their "internal security, by such general armaments, DURING THE PRESENT CONTEST "with *France*, in opposition to her system "of plunder and rapine, has been attended "with *the most pernicious consequences to "Austria*, and not a little contributed to "*the downfal of Prussia*. THEIR FATE "WAS DETERMINED BY THE LOSS OF A "FEW BATTLES; AFTER WHICH THE ENEMY MEETING NO OBSTACLE, AND DREADING NO OPPOSITION FROM AN UNARMED POPULACE, suddenly forced his way "through the interior provinces, spread devastation and terror by his rapid and violent depredations, destroyed the scattered "remains of a routed army, and EFFECTED "A TOTAL OVERTHROW OF THEIR EMPIRES." Again: "The evident danger "that would arise in case (which God forbid should ever happen) the enemy might "penetrate into the interior of our empire, "*compel* us to adopt the most efficacious "measures to aver it, by the establishment "of a general TEMPORARY armament or "militia, which may be ready in all quarters and at a moment's notice, *to support "the regular troops*, and able to oppose to "the enemy at every step the invincible "force of the true sons of their country, "united for the preservation of *their most valuable enjoyments*." And, again: "The innumerable proofs of patriotism and "of loyalty displayed in ancient and modern times by the nobility of Russia, &c. "convince us how cordially, zealously, and "efficaciously, it will co-operate with us "for the speedy and successful completion "of such A PROVISIONAL armament or militia, as is indispensibly required, and "now ordained for public security, according to the regulations annexed hereto. "We are likewise well assured, that our "faithful corporations, and every class of "citizens, as well as the *crown peasants*, "and *freeboors* through the country, will "unite their efforts to bear the common "burthen of this important public duty for "the defence of our holy faith, and for individual preservation." By the regulations referred to, we learn that 612,000 of the population were to be immediately armed, in seven divisions; but, according to the genuine counsels of despotism, they were to continue NO LONGER THAN THE PRESENT DANGER EXISTED.——Here then, Sir, considering this as a primary essay of an arbitrary sovereign towards the defence of a country upon right principles, do we behold the first ray of real wisdom which has beamed upon the continent *for resisting the invasions of Napoleon*. It is, indeed, but a slight and solitary ray, and of feeble lustre, but still as it has its source in wisdom as well as in necessity, and is the practical acknowledgement of a great prince that the defence of a country cannot always be confided to A REGULAR ARMY alone, it is instructive. The only sound principle of defending a state by THE PEOPLE IN ARMS, is indeed historically as old as the commonwealth of *Israel*; and the utter insufficiency of REGULAR ARMIES to that end is now so completely rivetted in the conviction of reasoning men, that from henceforth the old and true system must gain ground. Our great northern ally has now, to a certain degree, anticipated the counsel which, a fortnight before his manifesto came to my knowledge, I had recommended for adoption in my letter of the 13th ult. to Lord *Howick*; namely, that not an English guinea should be given for bringing into the field mercenary armies, unless for every *hundred* mercenary soldiers of our allies, care were taken to see a *thousand* of their enslaved peasants armed and trained to defensive war. If there be any sincerity or merit in our professions of anxiety for "the deliverance of *Europe*," it must have for objects freedom and happiness among the people, as well as integrity of dominion and balance of power among the princes. Three years prior to "the downfal of *Prussia*," and two years anterior to the humiliation of *Austria*, I had likewise advised the princes of *Germany*, as their only security against French invasion, to "make allies of their people,"

by giving them freedom and arms;*by which means, when adopted, political light and liberty must progressively bless the whole continent. Thus, Sir, as the afflicting dispensations of Providence are for ever teaching us, good might be extracted from evil, and the French revolution might yet benefit the human race. But, if the princes and sovereigns of whom *France* is the scourge, will abate nothing of their own tyrannical maxims of government towards their miserable subjects, what friend to the human species will pity them when hurled from their thrones.——Before I take leave of the Russian Manifesto, give me leave to remark that this state paper issuing from a divan of despotism, ought to smite the consciences, and to crimson the cheeks of certain persons in a certain country claiming to be a land of liberty, and whose acts of government ought to issue from a congenial cabinet and a congenial legislature. Do we not in the Manifesto behold a lord of semi-barbarians,—a proprietor of human cattle in the lowest form of ignorance and slavery,—a potentate whose will is law; and whose mere displeasure can at any moment assign to the best man in his dominions a dungeon, Siberian misery, or death, overtaking in the race of justice at the very first step, that king whose ministers are the trustees and administrators of *the free government and constitution of England*, where, be it for the hundredth time by me repeated—it is the perpetual, legal, constitutional, and indispensible obligation of every man to be armed according to his pecuniary means; and where it is equally the perpetual obligation and duty of parliament and of every *minister of state*, to enforce the performance of that necessary service for the peace, order, tranquillity and safety of the state, and vigilantly to prevent its neglect or relaxation !† The Czar of the *Muscovites*, by the disasters which befel his two partners in the spoil of partitioned *Poland*, discovers, that when "*a population is an unresisting medium*," great kingdoms and empires are overthrown at a blow, and, beginning to tremble for his own crown, he issues a humble and most flattering manifesto to his nobility, and to a nation doubly enslaved, that is, enslaved to them and to him, courting them to an arms-bearing—but after what manner? and for what object? Why, as "a TEMPORARY, a "PROVISIONAL armament, DURING THE "PRESENT CONTEST," for what he is pleased to call "the tranquillity and integrity of his "empire." That indeed is his personal object; but in respect of the people, his real object is neither more nor less than that they shall take up arms to preserve—what?—why *their present hereditary slavery* to *that* nobility and *that* Czar! For, the very moment their courage and their virtues shall have freed him, at the expense perhaps of many thousands of their lives, from the dread of being hurled fron his throne, they—his "*faithful, brave, and magnanimous peo-*"*ple*,"—are, in the terms of this very manifesto, to be again disarmed and replaced in their bestial degradation; and for this forsooth it is, that, "by a manly firmness of "spirit, and a true sense of *national ho-*"*nour*," they are to be "united," and to expose their lives in the field of battle!—— But, I ask,—Had any of the ministers of an English king, had Mr. *Pitt*, or Mr. *Dundas* *, had Mr. *Addington* † or Mr. *Yorke*, in their several systems of national defence by the armed population gone one inch farther than this Czar of the Muscovites? Has Lord *Grenville*, or have you, Mr. *Windham*, gone one inch farther, than "*a* TEMPORA-"RY, *a* PROVISIONAL armament, during "THE PRESENT CONTEST," like this of the Autocrat of all the *Russias*? For every one of ye, I answer NO. Have any one of ye in your defensive systems taken for your guide *the constitution of your country*, which provides for the nation's defence the best and grandest system of arming that ever legislator or warrior framed? No. Having had that constitution forced upon your attention, has any one of ye ever uttered a single argument either to prove that it do *not* contain a defensive system of arms-bearing, or that that system for its military excellence does *not* merit the encomiums I have so oft bestowed upon it? No. When we see all succeeding ministers in their pretended plans for national defence uniformly as obstinately shutting their eyes to the inimitable wisdom of *the constitution*, and, contrary to their obvious duty, rejecting its admirable provisions for securing the peace, the tranquillity and the safety of the state, while they offer us no better substitutes than we have seen is to be found under the most rigorous despotism in *Europe*,—while even these vile substitutes are mere phantoms which they can annihilate at a breath—and while at the same time we see them, even with Olympic energy, contending with every despotic competitor for superiority in a standing army, dull indeed must be those intellects which do not disco-

* England's Ægis. Preliminary Address to the Volunteers.

* England's Æges Consult the Index.

* Lord Melville. † Lord Sidmouth.

ver their drift! If our statesmen really think an arbitrary, better for us than a limited, government, it would be but fair they should lay before us specimens of what it is, that we might make our choice. Two specimens of Russian government occur to me at this moment. One is as follows: an English gentleman told me that, while he was residing at *St. Petersburgh* a man of property and of some consideration in the country, was ordered, by an officer of the government whom he met in the street, to accompany him whither he was going. He was conducted into an inclosed yard where stood a cabin upon wheels. Into this carriage the gentleman was instantly locked, horses were put to, and a journey commenced. Receiving light only from a small aperture in the roof, the imprisoned man knew not what road his conductors pursued, but after travelling some weeks, he was bid to come out and was led into the habitation of a stern old man, to whom a letter at the same time was delivered. The reader alternately perused his letter, and the countenance and figure of his prisoner; when, turning to his conductor, he cried, 'This is not the man: take him back.' He accordingly resumed his place in the travelling cabin immediately, and after being reconveyed to *St. Petersburgh* again, was set down where he had been originally taken up, and bid to go about his business. He did so; but without daring to ask why he had been so treated.—*Is it to this sort of government, the advocates for an immense unbalanced standing army want to conduct us?*—The foregoing anecdote I address to the MEN of *England*. My other I address to the WOMEN. It comes to me through an English gentleman who has had considerable intercourse with the Russian military. A Muscovite prince becomes the admirer of a beautiful woman of *Moscow* and declares his passion. As the only honour intended the fair one is that of being a mistress, his addresses are rejected. Courtship failing, menace ensues; and menace failing, disappointed lust gives place to infernal revenge. A party of *regular, well-disciplined soldiers*—the ultimate instrument ever uppermost in the despotic mind—are now introduced, and in a brutal contempt of the tears, the supplications, the shrieks and agonies of beauty and virtue, a succession of rapes by these savages is the punishment inflicted on the offending female—a punishment terminating in her death. *Is it*, I again ask, *to this sort of government the advocates for an immense unbalanced standing army want to conduct us?* Is it to such treatment Mr. *Windham* would expose his lovely countrywomen? Verily, verily, such are the fruits of despotism; as despotism itself must, Sir, be the fruit of such an immense unbalanced standing army as you are labouring to establish and render permanent! The only possible prevention of such a despotism is, that such standing army, by an honest resort to the military energies of the English constitution, shall be effectually counterbalanced by *the people in arms*, systematically organized under laws indued with a self-enforcing principle, and that people habitually trained to war in self-defence. But, Sir, your Training Bill is complete evidence to prove, that you are as watchful and assiduous in preventing a resort to the energies of the constitution to preserve our liberties, as you are in building up a standing army to subvert them. But I had nearly forgotten to mention in what way a Russian prince is amenable for such conduct as above related. He might, had his sovereign pleased, have had his head struck off without trial or ceremony; but in this case he was *reprimanded*. From such a redress of grievances heaven defend my country!——According to the notion of *Montesquieu*, that hot climates generate slavery and cold ones freedom, we should expect to find *Muscovy* a land of liberty; but, recollecting that "the nation which parts with its sword parts with its liberty," and that in this view it is a question admitting of degrees, let us by way of putting the case in a new light, form an imaginary thermometrical scale for measuring, by means of the popular arms-bearing of the two nations of *Muscovy* and *England*, the proportion of liberty that each may now be said to possess. It must be remembered prior to the new popular arms-bearing abovementioned, *Muscovy* had *no* liberty; for, to speak thermometrically, its liberty might be said to be at the point of despotic congellation, or equal to 0 on the scale; while under the genial constitution of *England*, liberty ought to stand at the highest degree of the scale. Although the real difference between no liberty and complete liberty, is as nought to infinity, yet we will call the highest degree, such as would be the proper effect of an English constitution in its purity, 10,000 only. The freedom in consequence of the present popular arming of *Russia* then, all other things considered, we cannot estimate as higher than 5 degrees above 0, or the point of despotic congellation. But as this *Russian* arms-bearing, and the arms-bearing of *England*, are now in essentials *precisely the same*, a mere "TEMPORARY, PROVISIONAL ARMAMENT, DURING THE PRESENT CONTEST," and both alike may at

the DISCRETION of the crown be put an end to at any moment, the liberty of *England* must at this time be designated by the same degree on the scale, namely, 5. Hence, therefore, it should appear, that while the liberty of *Russia* is for the present 5 degrees above its original nothingness, that of *England* is below its own proper level 9995 degrees out of 10,000!!! If any English minister can allow the effect of such a comparison to attach to his measures, I shall not envy his greatness paid for at such a rate.—Before I conclude, give me leave, Sir, to call your attention to the testimony in favour of *the necessity of arms-bearing of a people to the existence of political liberty* that has lately been given even by *Napoleon*, on which I have already made some remarks in my letter of 13th January to Lord *Howick*. The French Emperor apparently bounding the views of his ambition in the north-east to the confines of *Germany*, meaning there to raise up a complete barrier against the irruption of Russian armies into his empire, and perfectly well knowing the most effectual means to that end, he professes not only to bless *Poland* with a complete deliverance from the three despots who had divided her as a spoil; but to confer upon, and guarantee to her, a real emancipation from arbitrary government. He accordingly invites the princes, the nobility, and the people *universally to take up arms as one man*. He has thus wisely laid in the first instance a good foundation for his success in that country, by exciting in the inhabitants warm hopes of deliverance and of freedom; and, as their future liberty must be his interest, and an object to him of great importance, it is naturally to be expected that, should his arms in the present contest prevail over those of *Russia*, *Poland* will have conferred on her a really-free government; and consequently a government of such strength as shall be capable of resisting any future attempt of the Muscovite to subdue her, or even to violate her territory by the march of an army across any corner of it. The enslaved Poles between the Corsican and the Muscovite are now in a situation resembling that of the once degraded English between Henry the Third and his barons. Had the Poles to do with either of the Emperors separately, chains and oppression are what alone they might expect, whereas, circumstanced as they are, it is the interest, and therefore the policy of imperial ambition, to restore them to independence and liberty.——In my subsequent letters, Sir, I shall examine in what degree your military system has found support in the arguments imputed to General *Sir John Doyle*, as delivered in the House of Commons on the 23d of January, and reported in the Courier newspaper of the 27th; as well as from two letters of a writer in the Political Register, under the signature of B.* I have the honour to remain with much respect, Sir, your most obedient humble servant,—JOHN CARTWRIGHT.——*Feb.* 24, 1807.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 12.

"Your *Novids*, and *Bluturcks*, and *Omers*, and stuff,
"Egad they don't signify this pinch of snuff;
"To give a young gentleman right education,
"The army's the very best school in the nation."
SWIFT'S *Soldier and Scholar.*

SIR,—In my last (p. 213) I had, in some degree, taken my leave of you; and, therefore, you may feel surprized at receiving a fourth letter with the signature P. F. However, I then entertained some doubt whether you thought my remarks worthy of insertion and I have now to confess my obligation to you for their appearance, which it would be unpardonable in me to neglect doing. Thank you too for the fair and ingenuous manner in which you have introduced them to your readers: you say there is not one argument contained in them, which you "cannot demolish in three minutes." By that I suppose you meant to recommend them to an impartial and candid perusal. Probably, however, when your demolition takes place, I may, if I am suffered, build fresh arguments out of the fragments, which may have more consistency than the old ones. At all events, this is a pretty plain hint of the manner in which, you will say at least, the dispute has terminated. But whatever answer *you* may be disposed to return *me*, it was rather singular that you had not observed, that my letter contained something like a reply, at least to your correspondent W. F. S. No. 4, whom you have thought proper to puff so strangely. He challenges the Oxonian to produce any one idea acquired from his acquaintance with the learned languages, which was not "previously" to be found in some original or translated English work: now, I think I have shewn, that not one idea only, but that the great accession of ideas, which has flown in upon Europe since the 12th century to the present day, has sprung generally from this source; and I will defy him or you to shew any other cause of our pre-eminence in science over the gloomy ages of superstition. Why, when the light of antient literature waswith drawn, did the world become dark? And why, when it was rekindled, did the world become again enlightened? I referred you to one particular instance, on the subject of

---

* V. x. p. 836, and V. xi. p. 123.

government and a " limited constitution" in Hume, and I could take any other object of knowledge, and shew the benefit we have derived, and do derive therein, from the antient authors. W. F. S.'s description of wisdom, if he means to exclude the antient authors from it, is peculiarly unfortunate, as he has spoken of wisdom of those kinds, in which they are undoubtedly most pre-eminently excellent; I mean the moral wisdom which regulates the duties we owe to ourselves and to society. On which subjects I will thank you or him, to shew me any two modern treatises to compare with " Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates," and " Tully's Offices."—There can be no doubt, indeed, but that Socrates was the greatest moral teacher the world has ever seen, next to our Saviour: and Addison frequently supposes him to have been possessed of a degree of inspiration.—Equally happy is W. F. S. in his reference to Dr. Johnson's Dictionary, not one page of which could have been composed without the most accurate, profound, and extensive knowledge of the learned languages: and equally modest is he in calling him your friend, though a very slight acquaintance with the works of that great man, would have taught him that he is directly at enmity with you on the point in question. But what can a falling man do? When he has not a friend to support him he must catch at a foe. Nor is it with Dr. Johnson alone that you are at variance; the hostility reaches to all his most intimate connections; this, for example, is the opinion of Dr. Goldsmith on the subject in dispute. " What historian can render virtue so ami-
" able as Xenophon? Who can interest
" the reader so much as Livy? Sallust is
" an instance of the most delicate exactness,
" and Tacitus of the most solid reflection.
" From a perfect acquaintance with these,
" the student may acquire more knowledge
" of mankind, a more perfect acquaintance
" with antiquity, and a more just manner
" of thinking and expression, than perhaps
" from any others of any age or country." Now, W. F. S. tells me, in opposition to this, that not one idea is to be gathered from these or any other classical author, " which " was not *previously*" (mark that word, and tell me if there was no confusion in the head of the man who used it), " which was " not *previously* to be found in some one of " the works of John Bell." Which of these two persons must I believe? The dead author or the living? Dr. Goldsmith, or W. F. S.? " I'll take the ghost's word for " a thousand pounds." W. F. S. tells us, that an idea is but an idea though expressed in ever so many languages; and, after this profound discovery, he goes on to more doubtful matter, and there too he goes wrong: he supposes the *number* of ideas to constitute the quantity of wisdom possessed by any one; which it no more does, than does a " rabble rout" of fellows form an army.—Who may have entered into this conspiracy, that W. F. S. speaks of " to de-
" preciate the beauty, sublimity, &c. &c. of
" the English language," I know not; but certainly not the men remarkable for great classical attainments; not Hooker, Bacon, or Raleigh; not Milton, Locke, or Boyle; not Addison, Swift, or Steele (not these cap-and-gown men, by the way); they are the men who have enriched, harmonized, and beautified it, by words drawn from classical sources, by modes of expression, and structure of sentences analogous to the clear and luminous method of the Greeks and Romans. Bacon avows, that where he found his native tongue defective, he was not remiss in borrowing of the ancients; and by these men, and by these means, has our language been brought to its present state of perfection; and not ours only, but all the other languages of modern Europe; they all of them date the period of their improvement from the introduction of classical reading; and the purest authors of the French, Spanish, Italian, and English nations, are universally the men most conversant in the writings of Greece and Rome.

" When we did gabble like things most brutish,
" they endow'd our purposes with words that made
" them known."—Tempest.

And you would repay their favours like another Caliban:

" You taught me language, and my profit on't
" Is, I know how to curse. The red plague rid you
" For learning me your language!"—Ib.

And now a word or two with you, Mr. Cobbett. The awkward praises with which you have bespattered the illustrious name of Pope, make me suppose you may have some value for his opinion, though I see you are but little acquainted with his writings. Let us hear what he says in this matter:

" Still green with bays, each ancient altar stands,
" Above the reach of sacrilegious hands;
" Secure from flames, from envy's fiercer rage,
" Destructive war, and all-involving age," &c.

I do not wish to crowd you with a long quotation, and therefore refer you to the whole passage, at l. 180. of the " Essay on Criticism." Read also his characters of Homer, Virgil, Aristotle, Horace, Quintilian, Longinus, &c. in the same work, and then tell me if you expect to be believed when you say, " that the time spent on such authors
" is worse than uselessly employed." See farther l. 683:

" Learning and Rome alike in empire grew,
" And arts still follow'd where her eagles flew;
" From the same foes at last both felt their doom,
" And the same age saw learning fall and Rome."

And then he goes on to speak of the revival of learning:

" But see each muse in Léo's golden days," &c.
L. 696.

One more quotation, and I have done:

" Be Homer's works your study and delight,
" *Read* them by *day*, and meditate by night." L. 124.

Now here, you see, Pope's " wise and just mind," and your " wise and just mind," are as much at variance as the Fiend and Launcelot Gobbo's conscience. " Read," quoth Pope. " Read not," quoth Cobbett. Whom then must we trust? " Pope, say I, " you counsel well; Cobbett, say I, you counsel ill." Merchant of Venice, Act. ii. scene 2.—" Demolish," then, what arguments you please, or say you demolish them, the plain state of the question is this, and your attempting to prove any thing short of it, is but like the raving of a maniac, who gnaws the chain that binds him; you are to shew us some reason for our preferring your opinion against the utility of ancient literature, though you confessedly and manifestly know nothing about it, to that of all the wise men in Europe, who have studied the classical authors themselves, and recommended them to others.——P. F.—*Feb. 8th.*

" LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 13.

SIR,——In the controversy which appears likely to take place respecting the Learned Languages, perhaps the opinions and reasoning of one who is totally unacquainted with them, and in possession of only a moderate knowledge of his own tongue, may neither be uninteresting nor unacceptable. The term learning as generally accepted (that is learning possessed) may be defined " the knowledge of the reflections of others." Learning stands distinguished from wisdom in this, " wisdom consists in the proper application not only of this knowledge, but of all the other knowledge we possess, towards the benefiting of mankind." Wisdom may be defined " the possession of superior virtue, " knowledge and understanding." And therefore, a man destitute of virtue may possess learning without possessing wisdom, and then to call him learned, according to W. F. S. we must call him cunning. I imagine that you mean by the Learned Languages the Latin, the Greek, and the Hebrew Languages, which general term " learned" was perhaps annexed to them at a time when the knowledge of them were peculiar to the most learned only amongst mankind. And by " general education" I suppose you to mean, " that education which is best adapted to assist mankind in managing the general concerns of life." The knowledge of our duty towards God can have nothing to do in this question. Nor can the common rudiments of education. Then, leaving these two out of our consideration, let us suppose that a student may be called more or less perfect in " general education" in proportion—1. As he is more or less able rightly to appreciate the worth of his own actions.—2. As he is more or less able to trace the operations of the mind, in its researches after knowledge.—3. As he knows more or less of the constitution or the properties of things, and of the causes of the various phenomena of nature.—4. As he is more or less acquainted with the habits, prejudices, and passions of man, and with their operation upon his acts.—5. As he is more or less able in a concise, perspicuous, and interesting manner, to communicate his reflections unto others. Allowing this theory to be correct, let us next inquire, what are the means which an Englishman possesses from his own native language only, towards the acquirement of these accomplishments. —In speaking upon this part of the subject, be it observed, that my acquaintance with books and authors is very limited, and that in mentioning the means which I myself have made use of towards that end, I shall, in all probability, leave out many others equally deserving to be mentioned.—1. The treatise which appears to me the best calculated to ground youth in the knowledge of those rules by which they may estimate the right or the wrong, the merit or demerit of their own actions, is Dr. Adam Smith's Theory of Moral Sentiments. A very moderate capacity only is required in order to understand it, and whoever understanding it shall never do an act which that theory condemns, the same cannot be an *evil* member of society. In riper years when they become capable of more mature reflection, Dr. Paley's celebrated treatise will lead them past the theoretical part, and applying it to many of the most important circumstances occurring in life, conduct them to a fuller knowledge of the heart, and of the consequences resulting from the wrong decisions of the mind, preparing a strong ground work, whereon to build their future knowledge of mankind, and the tendency of their acts.—2. If there had never been a word wrote upon this part of general education, except Mr. Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, the reading and comprehending of the reflections it contains, would unto any one having a capacity enabling him to apply them to use, give sufficient instruction with regard to the

operations of his own mind in its researches after knowledge.—3. Connected with this part of general education it would be endless to enumerate the English treatises we are possessed of. Nor, in our present inquiry, does it appear necessary, for, except in the colleges, there is neither art nor science attempted to be treated upon, or at least taught or lectured upon, in any language except our own; nor is there any *verbatim* translation that I have heard of, whereunto the English authors have not added something material, unless it be the translation of the Elements of Euclid.—4. Before we have a correct knowledge of man, we must know him not only circumstanced as an individual, but as one collectively included amongst many individuals, and the knowledge of him in this latter capacity is by far the more important knowledge of the two. He has vices and virtues peculiar to himself. He has vices and virtues which he partakes of, or communicates to others, through the influence of example, as a member of the state to which he belongs. History and biography no doubt materially assist the man of superior mind in discovering the secret springs upon which these qualities depend, but it is most material that he will know his own heart, and that with unremitting care, he search into the eccentricities, passions, &c influencing the hearts of others whose acts he constantly sees,—and into the ultimate consequences of those acts. [And when he would form any general conclusion, he will well compare it with the evidence, which by these two means he becomes possessed of. Now, in these comparisons his own prejudices *will* have their influence. But, I think his own observations upon mankind themselves, made with the care here presupposed, will have the advantage over those made from history and biography (as the test of the truth or fallacy of such conclusions) inasmuch as in history and biography he must form his opinion of the intention or cause of the action, from the bare recital of the action itself, whilst the actions occurring under his own observation, are themselves *seen*, and every thing resulting from them *known*; nay, perhaps, the same action and its results often seen, and our expectations confirmed or rectified. Yet inasmuch as the knowledge of history and biography may be of service to us, we have undoubtedly the means of obtaining it, there being neither state nor individual, whose fortunes or whose acts have deserved to be put upon record, but our own historians have executed the duty with truth and ability, either in translating from antient authors, or by means of their own researches and inquiries; but, I again repeat that in this part of education he is the best scholar who can correctly read man, and to such a one man himself, living, is the best treatise he can read.——5. Towards the expressing our thoughts in a clear and nervous manner, so as to make a strong impression upon others, undoubtedly a sound understanding, having a distinct knowledge of its own thoughts, and of the manner in which it has come by them, will render us more essential service than all the grammatical knowledge of all the grammarians who ever treated upon the subject. For my own part, educated in a country school, I never knew what was meant by grammar until 16 years old, though I had seen the master set about six of the principal scholars tasks, in a small book, which I knew was called a Grammar; nor, do I know now, whether I write strictly grammatical or otherwise, although half that number of years now, is added to my age; and although, I have during that time, had the benefit of reading, and, as I think in some measure of understanding, the Lectures of Dr. Blair; yet, since I myself can understand the meaning of what I write; I have the vanity to suppose others can also, and, I think, that if I had the grammatical and rhetorical knowledge I am desirous of having, it would alter very little my style of expression; for, I think, whatever belongs not to the subject of any inquiry, and is introduced into such inquiry, however beautiful it may be, never assists in discovering, but often assists in concealing the truth. Keeping, however, these conclusions in mind, grammar and rhetoric, as taught by Dr. Blair, can never fail to assist the writer in arranging his thoughts more advantageously and agreeably; and, whoever having a sound understanding, hath been grounded in the rudiments of grammar, and completed this part of his education by becoming acquainted with the works of English authors, such as Blair, Milton, and others of equal merit in prose and poetry, will, if he hath made profitable use of his acquaintance, be able I presume to express himself on any subject with more eloquence and propriety. —Having now gone through the examination of the means afforded by the English language towards accomplishing our general education; my next (if this be found worth publication) will proceed to examine as to what use the Learned Languages can render us in this respect.—I am, Sir, &c.—N. S. Y.

—*Stafford, Feb.* 12, 1807.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75. Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Brydges Street Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall Mall.